

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH is best known by a volume on *The Person of Christ* in the International Theological Library.' But he has published a volume on *The Originality of the Christian Message* (Duckworth; 5s. net) by means which we believe that not only his skill as a writer but his learning as a theologian will be still more clearly seen. It is a volume of lectures—lectures delivered on the Haskell Foundation, in the Theological Seminary of Oberlin College, Ohio—and Professor MACKINTOSH is one of the very few learned theologians who can lecture well. Nothing is ever lost of the learning in the lecture, and nothing is ever lost of the lecture in the earning.

---

His purpose is to prove that Christianity when appeared in the world was essentially a new religion. Some of us believe that that needs little proving. But Dr. MACKINTOSH is aware of the literature that has gathered round the Study of Religions. He knows that the originality of Christianity is the most difficult thing in the world to prove now. And he also knows that it the thing most worth proving.

---

It is most worth proving. For if Christianity is not essentially original, it is not essentially superior to other religions. And if it is not superior to other religions, what has the missionary

to carry with him to peoples professing Buddhism, Muhammadanism, Taoism, or any other of the great religions? What has he to say to the adherent of Judaism? 'It is a matter,' says Dr. MACKINTOSH, 'of crucial moment for the advocate of foreign missions.' And he quotes Mr. J. H. Oldham, an unrivalled authority on such a subject: 'The nerve of missionary endeavour,' says Mr. Oldham, 'is the conviction that in the Christian revelation there is something distinctive and vital which the world cannot do without.'

---

But it is very difficult to prove the essential originality of Christianity. 'It was one theme of the second-century Apologists, and well-known discussions of it abounded in the eighteenth century, though the chief disputants showed very little sense for history. But on the modern mind it bears with a quite peculiar sharpness of impact. The scientific Study of Religions, which has recently made giant strides and has proved of such value to theology in its historic and apologetic branches as permanently to widen our view of the religious life of man, prevents us from assuming so naïvely as our grandfathers did that the Christian faith is unique and independent. God has nowhere left Himself without witness.'

---

'A great missionary once said that he had never preached the Gospel anywhere without finding

that God had been there before him. Not only have there been revelations less adequate than Christianity, but devout souls through these less perfect media were enabled in a real measure to trust God and do His will with an obedient faith to which the Father surely responds. There has been genuine fruition for such worshippers, not aspiration merely; and the Church has scarcely yet appreciated the width of the charter to hope given by St. Peter's great words, "In every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him." By degrees we are learning to conceive of Christianity not as an isolated thing—truth in sheer contrast to ethnic lies—but as the climax and crown of other faiths in their nobler meaning.'

"To describe one religion, however, as "the climax and crown" of others is clearly to discriminate most positively among religions everywhere in respect of truth and value; it is to apply a standard of excellence or perfection. Hence we cannot too often remind ourselves that the principles of historical research, relating as they must to purely causal issues, are insufficient for these deeper questions of validity. Our conviction, if we have it, that Christianity is the best religion in the world—better, say, than Judaism or Buddhism—is in no sense the fruit of merely scientific or disinterested thought. It is rather the reaction of our whole nature to the spiritual meaning with which the historian's facts are laden. It is a value-judgment, in short, irreducible to terms that express purely causal relationships. And to perceive that things are what they are and what they come from—in other words, to make a clear distinction between truth and genesis, origin and value—is the first and possibly the last lesson which the student of religious history ought to master."

But what is Christianity? Clearly that is the first thing to settle, and Professor MACKINTOSH recognizes it. His definition is short. 'For my part, I take the Christian religion to mean, in

essence, fellowship with God mediated through Jesus Christ.' It is as sufficient as it is short. That is Christianity, and just that is what no other religion is. The originality of Christianity lies in its power to bring us into communion with God, and it is properly called Christianity because it is Christ that brings us into that communion. Dr. MACKINTOSH's whole book is an exposition of that definition.

Take a single item. Jesus had to make God known. For until a man knows God he is not likely to desire to have fellowship with Him. He was original in the God He revealed, in the way he revealed Him, in the completeness of the revelation, and in its universality.

First, Jesus Christ was original in the God He made known. It was a God who goes forth in search of the sinful. 'The best that had formerly been proclaimed was that God in mercy would receive all who came back to Him penitently; now, for the first time in the history of religion, it was made known that the Father unweariedly seeks the lost, that He reckons no cost too great if only His children can be reached and won. As men stood in Jesus' presence, as they looked back on all that His coming had meant for them, they realized that the bounds of their conception of God had been enlarged. It was not merely that God willed their salvation: He took the first step; He bowed to the law which makes sacrifice the first charge on love's resources.'

Next, He made this God known, not in His teaching, but in Himself. 'No such person as Jesus had ever lived before, and in His character and experience God was perfectly known at last. Every great man is greater than his language, and psychologists or historians whose foible it is to disparage the originality of humanity's leaders by asking dubiously how much of what they say had been said before, overlook the vital fact that epoch-making progress in the past has invariably come not by words but persons. The new truth

about God became flesh in Jesus; He guaranteed the message by being Himself; mediated by all that He was and did, it seized men with fresh elemental power and passed like fire from heart to heart.'

---

Thirdly, this revelation was new in its purity, its coherence, its inward spiritual harmony. 'Again grant for the moment that every word of Jesus concerning God had been uttered previously; still, the omissions were new. The Pharisee, it is true, had spoken of God's grace and holiness, but he had unfortunately said other things which made grace and holiness more than doubtful. The Eternal had been occasionally represented as a deity of autocratic and capricious power, who laboured under feelings of revenge. But this means that truth is hopelessly cancelled out by untruth. Error throws it so far into the background that its power over conscience and heart fades. To give a pure thought of God—to convince men that God is light and in Him is no darkness at all—is accordingly to give a new thought. This pure thought of necessity has for its medium a pure life. The authentically Christian view of God, from which the obscuring elements have been cleared away, is distilled through that which we know Jesus to have been.'

---

Lastly, the God whom Jesus made known is the God of all men. 'National and particularistic limits are abolished once for all. In the Old Testament, the Fatherhood of God is strictly a correlative of the chosen people, and is stretched by way of exception to cover the *gerim* or resident aliens who had become naturalized in Israel. We must bear in mind that even the author of Psalm xxiii. would have repudiated the suggestion that the words, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want," could be rightly adopted by a Greek or Persian. Thus within Israel the love of God is clear as the sun, but scarcely God's love for man as man. For that the world must wait for Jesus. In Him every limitation is overthrown. The lost son in the Parable, who is met with kisses

and a feast, is no lost Jew simply, no fallen member of the chosen people; he is the lost *man*, the Father's straying child in any time or place. Even Jesus uttered no more piercing word than "There is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth."

---

'Yet how few we Friends are.'

---

Mr. John W. GRAHAM, M.A., Principal of Dalton Hall, University of Manchester, has written a book on *The Faith of a Quaker*, which has been published at the Cambridge University Press (21s. net). It is not a well written book, nor is it well arranged. But we should not be wrong if we accepted it as the official doctrine of the Society of Friends to-day—if anything that belongs to Quakers can be called official. In the end of the book Mr. GRAHAM uses the words, 'Yet how few we Friends are.'

---

Why are they so few? Mr. GRAHAM gives two reasons—the want of placed ministers and the absence of music in worship. But the sympathetic reader of this book will conclude that there is a reason lying deeper than these.

---

If he concludes that it is the absence of the sense of sin he will be confirmed by the index. In the index there is one reference to sin. It is to a single short paragraph on a single page. Throughout the book there is no recognition of disagreement with God. That every man is out of harmony with his Maker, through his own conduct—for we need not ask Mr. GRAHAM to entertain the idea of inherited sin—that is not taken account of. It is not denied. It is simply ignored. The whole book—this modern exposition of the creed of the Quaker—is written on the assumption that man is right with God and has nothing to do but recognize it.

---

Is that Mr. GRAHAM's own modern idea? It is also for Quakerism ancient, as ancient as it

could be. ‘It is remarkable,’ says Mr. GRAHAM, speaking of George Fox, ‘that confession of sin, pardon, conscious weakness, repentant retracing of error, are wholly absent either in his times of darkness or of light. He says: “When I came to eleven years of age I knew pureness and righteousness, for while I was a child I was taught how to walk to be kept pure.” We have here a symmetrical well-formed natural leader, “in unity with the creation,” to use a phrase of Fox, and in whom the control from the beginning was where it ought to be. We may be quite sure that if there had been a period of sin or decadence in his life we should have heard about it, and it would have affected his gospel; but never from him do we hear the cry, “Who will deliver me from this body of death?”’

Now that is not a popular doctrine. It does not appeal to the average man. It may be that the average Quaker does not worry about his sins. The average man does. God has made the average man so. Mr. GRAHAM says, and he seems sorry to have to say it, that ‘the needs of most people we do not appear to meet.’ He had that word in mind when he spoke of the preaching of John Wesley.

For this is how he speaks of John Wesley. ‘It has sometimes been said that the failure of Quakerism to reach the masses led to the ground being covered by the Methodist Revival. However efficient Friends had been in their own line of service, I do not think they offered milk for babes. John Wesley, with his terrible preaching of Hell, his cheap salvation (cheap in theory at least), by escape through the merits of another, his stimulating hymns, and his verbal Biblical interpretation, widespread and popular as his teaching has become, could not have done his particular work through any Quakerism true to the name.’

There being no sense of disharmony with God, there is no room for those doctrines which have

to do with the reconciliation wrought by Christ. They are openly, even scornfully, rejected by this candid writer. They have never been of any value, and now at last (by the criticism of the New Testament) they are found to be of no authenticity.

So is it with the Atonement. ‘The evangelical doctrine of Atonement, as I am using the word historically, ascribed the salvation of mankind here and hereafter to their annexing for themselves, even while yet sinful, the infinite merits of the crucified Redeemer, whose shed blood was regarded as the equivalent in the Divine sight for the sins of the world. This doctrine most people now find incredible, unspiritual, and even immoral.’

Still more so is it with the doctrine of the Trinity. ‘It has, of course, no more authority than a Roman Emperor and a Church Council under his presidency and control can give it. It was no part of the thought of Jesus nor of Paul. The two passages where it occurs are interpolations of the usual doctrinal type—the one in 1 John, now deleted, confessedly so; the other, the baptismal formula in the last words of Matthew’s Gospel, held so by a large consensus of scholars. But the doctrine represents one of those hard and fast lines of division and classification which are never of more than mere temporary use as scaffolding, and are really in their permanence the bane of theology.’

And most significantly is it so with the Person of Christ. There being no need of a Redeemer, no Redeemer is discovered in the man Christ Jesus. Not because He is not supernatural enough. Mr. GRAHAM has no difficulty in assigning to Jesus all that we care to demand in the matter of the supernatural. For he holds that every human being has powers and possibilities that are quite incalculably supernatural. Mr. GRAHAM is a believer in thought-transference and all the other ideas that are associated with what is called Spiritualism.

'To a mind accustomed to these ideas,' he says, there is no difficulty in accepting both the pre-existence and the continued present life of one so remarkable on earth as Jesus of Nazareth. 'Before Abraham was, I am'—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." These words are easily acceptable. The miracles of healing—of apparently supernatural knowledge or prophecy—of the Transfiguration—present no real difficulty to a psychical researcher's mind. Neither does the Resurrection, understood as Bishop Westcott and Prof. Lake and others understand it, as the raising of a spiritual, not a fleshly, body. On this view the parallel drawn by the apostle gains its validity—"If Christ rose, then we shall rise." Otherwise the apostle's parallel fails.'

---

In like manner Mr. GRAHAM has no difficulty in accepting the doctrine of Christ's divinity. But he has no use for it. For we are all divine. We all have God dwelling in us. The very purpose of his book is to show the rightness and the reasonableness of the Quaker belief in the indwelling God. Now the indwelling God makes every man a God-man. What advantage, then, has Jesus? He has no advantage beyond the possibility that in Him dwelt more of the fulness of the Godhead.

---

Nor does Mr. GRAHAM seem to be in the least concerned that in this he is out of touch with the Pauline or other New Testament teaching, for he cannot have forgotten that according to that teaching it is Christ Himself that dwells in our hearts by faith.

---

The doctrine of the Trinity 'represents one of those hard and fast lines of division and classification which are never of more than mere temporary use as scaffolding, and are really in their permanence the bane of theology.'

---

It would have been well if Mr. GRAHAM, before he passed that sentence for press, had read the

chapter in the Cole Lectures for 1919 on the Social Life of God. The Cole Lectures are delivered before Vanderbilt University. Sixteen courses have now been delivered there. And every course has been successful. For both man and subject have been chosen carefully. The sixteenth course of lectures has been published under the title of *The Productive Beliefs* (Revell; \$1.50 net). Rarely have we read a more stimulating book. The author is the Rev. Lynn Harold HOUGH, D.D., President of Northwestern University.

---

The last chapter is entitled 'The Social Life of God.' Its subject is the Trinity.

---

But it does not begin with the Trinity. It begins with the most striking fact of to-day—the emergence of the sense of brotherhood. Dr. HOUGH calls it the 'social passion.' 'The social passion,' he says, 'is the pervasive mastering experience of our time. The world is dreaming of brotherhood as it never dreamed of brotherhood before. It has a new and powerful determination to make brotherhood actual in the lives of men. It has an impatience with social injustice, and a determination to right the wrongs which blight human life, which give it a distinctive character. It deeply intends to make the very structure of civilization the support of brotherhood and not in any sense its foe. Man's inhumanity to man is to cease, and society is to become a noble mother to us all.'

---

What is the source of this longing for brotherhood? Has it any foundation in the nature of things? Passionate enough to-day, is the whole wonderful enthusiasm a passing wave of emotion? If we get back to the last and ultimate reality in the universe, shall we find a basis and a justification for the social passion there? Shall we find its source in God?

---

Let us study the nature of God that we may see. For 'the very greatest danger to which the social passion is subjected is just the danger which

comes from the suggestion that it is all very beautiful and very noble and very fine, but that it is an entirely impractical and visionary thing. We may be told that it is quite natural for young men who have never had much experience of the actual vicissitudes of life to give themselves with an abandon of enthusiasm to the fight for an achieved brotherhood in the world. But we may be reminded sagely that they will grow older and that the disillusioning experiences of the advancing years will give them a practical poise based upon the apprehension that shimmering sunlit dreams must be tested by the hard stern facts of a very real if a very unlovely world. Now as long as our enthusiasms last we may smile with superior and lofty optimism at such critical suggestions. But the difficulty is that these suggestions come not only from consciously hostile opponents of our position. In a sense they come up from life itself. Even if nobody takes the time to call us visionaries, a long succession of painful and humiliating experiences is likely to put just that word into our own minds.'

Now when we turn to study the nature of God we are at once arrested with this assurance. *There can be nothing of abiding reality in man that is not already in God.* 'If the dream of unselfish brotherhood is something God willed for man without ever possessing it Himself then it can never have the mightiest sanction or the most powerful pressure in our own lives. But if we can carry it back beyond the will of God into the very nature of God then it will be secure for us forever.'

That it belongs to the nature of God is not the private opinion of the Cole lecturer for 1919. It is the repeated declaration of Christ. 'In the memorable intercessory prayer of Jesus which is recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel, the Master is praying for the disciples whom He is so soon to leave. He requests with the most profound and deep solicitude, "That they may be one, even as we." And a little later in

the same great prayer, He is speaking of all that vast company of those who shall become His followers in the future, and He prays "that they may all be one; even as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us." In a moment He recurs again to the same mastering and dominating idea, "that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one." Now if we are to give any sort of actuality to these words they must mean that the perfect life of the Father and the Son in the harmony of joyously self-forgetful love is to be the type for the life of that brotherhood of loving men which Jesus founded. He sees in the eternal life of God a pattern for the life of men in time. The Godhead is an eternity of mutual life in love, and the Church is to become a reflection of that kind of loving brotherhood.'

We come to the doctrine of the Trinity. What does it mean? It means that 'the life of God has included always the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, three actual persons bound together in the oneness of a perfect life, each perfectly loving the others, each giving Himself in eternal unselfish joy to the others, the very life of God being an eternal glory of sacrificial love.'

Can we entertain such a belief to-day? What would be the value of it? 'The answer comes with a power and a momentum which fairly startles us. If the life of God is an eternal realization of all that we mean by a perfect social organism then the whole conception of society is lifted into new meaning and comes to participate in higher relationships. If the eternal experience of God is built about the actuality of unselfish love, if God Himself perpetually loses His life that He may find it, then it is true that unselfishness is not a soft and vague and impossible dream. It is more real than selfishness. It is more actual than all the hard self-assertiveness of which we know so much. It is as real as the very structure of the universe. It is as real as the nature of God.'

'And now we can afford to be patient. We can afford to wait. Time may seem to be against us. Eternity is on our side. In other words, we do not base our optimism upon a superficial confidence in human nature. We base our confidence upon the very essential quality of the life of God. We know that people have been false. We know that in an environment offering the best sort of opportunity and the noblest stimulus some people will be false. We are not surprised when employers betray workers and workers betray employers. We are not surprised when Peace Conferences are soiled by emerging national and individual selfishness. All these things we under-

stand. All these things we expect. And from the spectacle we look out to that eternal life of God which is perpetually based upon unselfish love. Here we find something solid and dependable. And in every bit of human unselfishness, in every human striving after brotherhood, in every human movement for a more orderly world, we see the expression on the field of this life of that which is the deepest verity in the life of all things. We believe, in spite of sad and heart-breaking experiences, in the triumph of brotherhood here, because we know that the brotherhood which reigns over the whole structure of things must at last come to reign in the life of man.'

## Synoptic Variations.

BY THE REVEREND WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D., FORMERLY PRINCIPAL OF  
LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

THE two-document theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels has opened up some questions that call for more investigation before the curious phenomena of alternate agreements and differences can be accounted for. I do not refer to the universally acknowledged fact that there is much in Matthew and Luke that cannot be traced either to Mark or to Q—for instance, the infancy stories at the beginning, the resurrection stories at the end, and the large amount of new matter in Luke, now sometimes indicated by the letter S. Nor am I thinking of the great differences in the rendering of some of Christ's sayings, especially the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, which point to different reports, perhaps two versions of Q (Q<sup>m</sup> and Q<sup>i</sup>). Over and above these obvious grounds of variations, we are confronted with differences in parallel passages of Matthew and Luke which we attribute to a common source, especially where we take that source to be Mark. How comes it that when Matthew (I use the name for convenience to designate the author of our first Gospel, although we cannot think him to be the Apostle—who may however, perhaps, have collected Papias' Logia, identical with our Q—and so have got his name assigned to the book which contains so much of it)—how comes it that this Matthew and Luke often

vary considerably from Mark even when their authority is Mark's Gospel? Dr. Abbott demonstrated in *Clue* that they used a later recension of Mark than those which we have handed down to us in our New Testament. This fact will account for some small points where we find Matthew and Luke agreeing together verbally in modification of Mark's phraseology. But there are many more cases in which they differ from one another as much as from Mark and to a much greater extent. These are the cases which call for attention, and they meet us on every page of the first and third Gospels.

A little consideration will suggest to us that they may conceivably be attributed to five causes—sometimes to one of these, sometimes to another: (a) *Literary taste*. One of the greatest merits of our Gospels is their ingenuous simplicity, their artless freedom from self-consciousness. None of the evangelists deal with their material in the manner of the literary historian, as in the case of Gibbon, Macaulay, Carlyle, Froude, writers who, differing greatly in their own mental outfits and habits of thought, shape and colour their materials accordingly. Nevertheless there are clear instances of choice of words, personal mannerisms, and, with all their objectivity and loyalty to truth, individual

sympathies, which have affected their ways of telling the common story. (b) *Critical emendation.* In some cases the evangelist may have ventured to omit or alter some detail in his source, because of inaccuracy or for some other objection, solely at the dictation of his own judgment. Every thinking historian does this. A little inquiry will enable us to see whether either Matthew or Luke felt at liberty to do so with Mark, and has, in fact, ever acted in this way. (c) *Constructive imagination.* All the four British historians just referred to have exercised this faculty, especially Carlyle, in the most daringly brilliant way, and Froude sometimes with unfortunate results as to objective veracity. It is the duty of the author of a literary historical work to go beyond the mere chronicler in making his characters live and give colour to his narrative. But while this awakens the reader's interest and helps him to realize in his own mind the scenes and persons that are presented to him, it has its dangers. We may be thankful, therefore, that the simplicity and directness of purpose manifested by our evangelists have excluded the free play of this valuable but hazardous constructive imagination; still we cannot affirm that they did not possess or employ a spark of it. This is a matter to be inquired about and looked for when we examine and compare the Gospel texts. (d) *Additional sources.* If in some cases the three causes of alteration to which I have referred fail to account for the fact, we may reasonably infer that the evangelists have some other source of information with which they are supplementing Mark. This may be either documentary or oral. Since confessedly both Matthew and Luke did use such sources for whole sections of their Gospels, there is no reason to deny that they may also have employed them for modifying or supplementing material drawn in the main from one particular source, such as Mark. (e) *Personal remarks and comments supplied by the author.* These, of course, are pure additions.

Now let us test the applicability of the five principles by taking one or two illustrative cases.

#### I. MARK i. 1-5; MATT. iii. 1-6; LUKE iii. 2-7.

i. Mark begins with a descriptive title of his book (1<sup>1</sup>), which, of course, neither of the other evangelists would carry over to his work, especially as neither of them begin it at this point. This comes under (e).

2. Immediately after his descriptive title and as an introduction to his account of John the Baptist, Mark quotes some sentences of Old Testament prophecy. Both Matthew and Luke repeat a part of this quotation; but they agree in postponing it till after they have mentioned the coming of John. This is very reasonable, because neither of them is here, like Mark, only beginning his book, so that the peculiar impressiveness of starting with a text of Scripture does not fall in with their plans. Still, we note the coincidence of both of them making this change. A more striking coincidence is to be seen in both of them omitting the first part of Mark's quotation (1<sup>2</sup>), for that evangelist had introduced it with an ascription of the whole to Isaiah, whereas this portion is taken from Malachi, and only the second part (1<sup>3</sup>) from the prophet to whom he inadvertently attributed the whole. Evidently this is an instance of (b)—a critical emendation. Now certainly this second coincidence of Matthew and Luke is remarkable. They may easily both have noticed Mark's lapse of memory and acted independently in their omissions. But, remembering that they were working on the later edition of Mark, perhaps we should surmise that the emendation was due to the editor of that edition, who may have been the evangelist himself correcting and smoothing his own work.

3. Next, following his Scripture quotation, in accordance with his abrupt style, Mark names John and describes his coming and preaching. The other evangelists, not having yet taken over the Scripture quotation, require to give some form of introduction for the Baptist. Both do this with notes of time. Matthew connects his coming with the preceding narrative, merely citing a favourite form of expression, 'in those days.' But Luke here inserts an elaborate reference to contemporary ruling authorities. This is in accordance with his method of connecting the Gospel narrative with world history. It demands no documentary authority. The evangelist falls back on his own knowledge, as an educated man. In both cases we have examples of (e)—personal remarks, or, rather, ascribe them to (d) as oral traditions.

4. In referring to the locality of John's mission, both Matthew and Luke make additions to Mark. Matthew simply defines the specific wilderness which Mark had mentioned vaguely, saying, 'the wilderness of Judæa,' an instance of (e), as the evangelist knows that this was the particular

wilderness of John's retreat. But Luke adds that John also came 'into all the region round about Jordan.' Here is additional information. We have not to search for any documentary or traditional authority for it; because further on Mk (1<sup>5</sup>) tells us that John was baptizing in the Jordan. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that he was also preaching there as well as in the wilderness. Luke's statement to this effect is an instance of (c), a product of constructive imagination.

5. Where Mark had a new sentence in the indicative—'and preached,' both Matthew and Luke turn this Hebraistic form into the more flowing Greek style by using the participle 'preaching.' Since they agree in doing this, we may again suspect the change to have been made ready for them in their edition of Mark.

6. While Luke follows Mark verbatim in giving the theme of John's preaching as 'the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins,' Matthew has an entirely different construction at this point, omitting any reference to baptism and adding important new matter. First, he has the dramatic form of direct speech — 'saying, Repent ye.' We might regard this as an instance of (a), simply a free literary reconstruction of the material, were it not for the sentence which follows, which is entirely new, having nothing corresponding to it in Mark, namely, 'repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' This is the only passage of the New Testament which states that John the Baptist definitely preached the near approach of the Kingdom, though we may say that all the evangelists imply as much by his announcing the advent of the Christ. Both Mark and Luke only give the announcement of the Kingdom being at hand as first appearing in the teaching of Christ. Matthew, and he alone, tells us that John anticipated Jesus, and that when our Lord made this the burden of His message, He was following the Baptist, this evangelist using exactly the same words in describing it. How came Matthew to do so? Is this a case of (c)—his constructive imagination? Did he assume without any authority that the phrase which the other Synoptics give as the main substance of the preaching of Jesus was not original, was taken over by the prophet of Nazareth from His predecessor, the prophet of the wilderness? Matthew's free handling of his material and readiness to construct flowing sentences should allow us to admit the possibility of this view. On

the other hand, the great importance of the statement may well incline us to think this a case of (d). Though it is impossible to say what authority, whether oral or documentary, Matthew was here using, there is some probability that it was Q, since that document is generally thought to have contained an account of the Baptist. The omission of any reference to baptism here, though that is mentioned by Luke after Mark, may well be attributed to (a), Matthew throughout giving the greatest prominence to preaching.

7. In his account of John's clothing and food, the coming of the people, and their baptism in the Jordan, Matthew closely follows Mark, varying the phrases according to his own way of writing (a), but depending on no other authority. His inclusion of the region of the Jordan among the districts from which the Baptist drew his disciples may well be accounted for by (c). Seeing that this was the scene of the baptism, it would be natural to infer that some of its inhabitants were to be found in the crowd of penitents. Luke is very concise here. He briefly epitomizes Mark (a), and reserves himself good space for a quantity of new material.

8. For their accounts of the preaching of John the Baptist, Matthew and Luke had to resort to some other authority than Mark, since that evangelist does not record it. In his characteristic way Matthew mentions the two principal parties among the Jews, saying that many of them were coming to John's baptism. This we assign to (c), or possibly to (d), Matthew having inferred from what he knew of the subsequent followers of John that these people came under his influence, or perhaps having learnt it from tradition, or again perhaps from the document which he is certainly quoting after this. Luke, a Gentile writing for Gentiles, is not so much interested in Jewish sects and parties, and therefore he makes no reference to them there, although he would have had knowledge of the fact which Matthew mentions, if it was in a common source that both evangelists used. Certainly the matter of John's preaching which they both record comes from a common source. As far as Matthew goes, Luke's agreement with him is verbally exact, except for two trivial variations: (1) where for 'fruit worthy' Matthew has singulars (*καρπὸν ἄξιον*), Luke has plurals (*καρπὸὺς ἄξιοὺς*), and (2) while Matthew (3<sup>9</sup>) has 'think not,' Luke (3<sup>8</sup>) has 'begin not'—variations which we may easily assign to (a). For the rest the verbal

identity proves identity of literary source. This may well have been Q, since there is reason to think that this work included some sayings of John the Baptist. The conversations with various people and the popular impression resulting from it, which Luke (3<sup>10-15</sup>) alone records, may have been included in the same document, Matthew not choosing to carry on his quotation so far. On the other hand, its being in part concerned with two classes of people to whom elsewhere Luke gives exceptional attention, namely, publicans and soldiers, may incline us to assign it to (d) as derived from S.

## II. MARK i. 7, 8; MATT. iii. 11, 12; LUKE iii. 16-18.

When we come to John's announcement of the coming Christ as reported in the three Synoptics we meet with a complicated problem. First, we have the material common to all three. Matthew and Luke give us everything that is in Mark, and therefore might be credited with using that evangelist as their source. Luke is nearer to Mark in having the idea of unloosing the shoe latches, while Matthew has that of bearing the shoes. If it were not for Matthew's close verbal agreement with Luke in what follows, we might think that he was using a different authority at this point. But that fact would lead us to assign the variation to (a), especially as elsewhere Matthew inclines to generalities where Mark condescends to graphic details. But now we have the agreements between Matthew and Luke where they have not the support of Mark. They both break with Mark's order of sentences, agreeing to put John's reference to his own baptism prior to the declaration of the coming mightier One, while Mark puts that reference after the declaration. This coincidence can hardly be accidental. Then the phrase, 'and with fire,' following 'the Holy Ghost,' in both Matthew and Luke, suggests that the whole sentence in which the two phrases occur comes from one and the same source. If so, we must conclude that, even in that part of it which Mark gives us, the two other Synoptic writers were not following Mark, but were drawing on the source from which they obtained the rest of this speech of John's. Again we may conjecture that this may have been Q. But whether that were the case or not, it would seem that Mark was also using it for so much of the speech as he recorded.

## III. MK. i. 9-11; MATT. iii. 13-17; LK. iii. 21, 22.

1. The three accounts of the baptism of Jesus may be assigned to Mark as the basal document of each, though with a very free handling of his introductory verse, some striking variations throughout, and some fresh material contributed by Matthew. Instead of the clumsy Hebraistic 'and' (*kai*) and the clause 'in those days,' Matthew begins with 'then' (*τότε*), and Luke with 'now' (R.V. for *δέ*); Luke then retains Mark's 'it came to pass,' Matthew dropping this Hebraism, and so characteristically abbreviating Mark in narrative and giving space for additions to the sayings. Similarly, Matthew drops Mark's reference to Nazareth, and so does Luke, who also omits Galilee (a). On the other hand, Luke states that Jesus was baptized at the time when all the people were baptized, an addition demanding no extra authority, but to be assigned to (c) as a natural historical inference characteristically deemed by Luke of human and theological interest. All the other variations at this point may be assigned to (a). They are purely literary; unless perhaps we see some further significance in the peculiarity of Luke's account.

2. The conversation in Mt 3<sup>14-15</sup>, found neither in Mark nor in Luke, is an instance of (d), and it may probably be assigned to Q.

3. The first clause of Mk 1<sup>10</sup>, 'and straightway coming up out of the water,' is omitted from Luke's briefer account. On the other hand, it is enriched in Matthew's characteristic way by an imaginative filling in of the picture (c), and so reads, 'And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water.'

4. The changes in the latter part of Mk 1<sup>10</sup> are very striking. That evangelist speaks of the vision (1) as seen by Jesus, and (2) His seeing the very process of the heavens being rent open (present participle *σχιζομένους*). In both these cases the other evangelists state the occurrence objectively, though Matthew preserves a reminiscence of the personal vision in saying, 'the heavens were opened unto him,' while Luke only has 'the heaven (singular) was opened.' These alterations may easily be assigned in each case to the author's personal choice of expressions (a).

5. In taking over the last clause of the verse in Mark, Matthew has another reminiscence of the vision as a personal experience of Jesus, saying, 'he saw the Spirit of God,' etc., while Luke is still

purely objective, saying, 'the Holy Ghost descended,' both evidently expressions of the author's own way of regarding the situation and therefore to be assigned to the category (*a*).

Further, Matthew follows Mark in representing the descent of the Spirit 'as a dove' to be a vision of Jesus. But Luke states this objectively—'the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form as a dove upon him.' He is even remarkably emphatic on this point, inserting the phrase, 'in bodily form.' We may compare this with his materialistic reference in words that he and he alone ascribes to the risen Christ (Lk 24<sup>89</sup>). We must assign

the phrase to the evangelist's constructive imagination (*c*).

6. The last verse in Mark (1<sup>11</sup>) is taken over verbally by Luke, who only changes 'the heavens' into 'heaven' as before. Matthew retains the former (Hebraistic) form. But he has two variations: (1) The dramatic 'lo' introducing an exclamatory sentence—an instance of (*a*), his own rhetorical construction. (2) Instead of the address of the *Bath kol* to Jesus Himself, in which Luke follows Mark, Matthew has this in the third person—'This is my beloved son,' etc.—another instance of (*a*), possibly due to catechetical repetition.

## 'I am the Good Shepherd': A Study.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN A. F. GREGG, D.D., BISHOP OF OSSORY.

IT is not without significance that it is the Fourth Gospel which records the assertion of the claim, 'I am the Good Shepherd.' This is the Gospel in which Jesus is represented as speaking of Himself as the Bread of Life, the Light of the World, the Resurrection, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the True Vine. These titles show that this Gospel is the Gospel of the Person of Christ as He is for the Church; not, as in the case of the other three, of Christ viewed as far as possible as He appeared in the Earthly Ministry, but of Christ as reflected upon in the light of Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, Christian Experience.

And since this is so, the interpretation of the title of Good Shepherd is prescribed for us by its setting. For while on the one hand, as we shall see, it offers a picture quite inadequate beyond a certain point, on the other hand its implications would be narrowed down to falseness, did we restrict them to what the Earthly Ministry manifested Jesus as being and doing.

The assumption of the title during the days of His flesh was mainly proleptic: it would be hardly more than the truth to say that, were it intended to portray Christ as He then was, the picture would have little interest for us to-day.

Two elements in combination were needed for the due realization of the office—the Person, and the Experience; and not until Christ had died and risen had He passed through the only Experience which could fit the Person for His task.

The office of Good Shepherd then is a Post-Resurrection office. It is the recognition of this that has caused the Good Shepherd to be the subject of the Gospel for the Second Sunday after Easter. Involving a personal relation, as is indicated by the fact that the shepherd calls his sheep, knows them, leads them out, suffers for them, it requires the shepherd's presence with his flock and his protecting care of it wheresoever its individual members may be. It is not enough that Christ was once a bright example, a compassionate healer, an inspiring teacher: the Good Shepherd must continue to provide souls with a never-failing rallying-point.

The office further calls for faithfulness and devotion even unto death. But once the shepherd has died for his flock his faithfulness and devotion are memories; he cannot repeat them; they are without effective value when the next crisis comes.

Accordingly, he who is to be the Good Shepherd for mankind must transcend time, place, death, if he is to make good his claim. He must be what the Resurrection alone made Christ, universal, living, penetrating.

### I.

The Good Shepherd must be *Universal*.

Something a great deal more extensive is involved than what our Lord could effect as He moved among men during the Ministry. That

Ministry was not central; it was partial, and rigidly limited in scope. It had to do with only a small class of people, and only a small area of territory. 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel'; 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles.' There is His own confession of limitation. When He spoke those words, He was a prophet of the Jews only; He was not yet a world-prophet. He was going to be the Good Shepherd, but He was not so yet, except potentially. He Himself was a Jew. But the world-shepherd must be central, or universal; He must be the property of every people, every place, every age, and that not only in the range of His thought, but in personal approachableness. He must not be local, restricted, or partial. And true universality could not be reached as long as He was living a mortal life. As long as He was mortal, and (like other mortal men) with His manhood subject to spatial limitations, He did not realize the essential conditions of an All-Shepherd.

## II.

The Good Shepherd must possess *Livingness*.

(a) It is a noble thing for the shepherd to die for his flock. But the usefulness of such sacrifice is soon exhausted. When he is dead, what of the sheep? Futility may easily be written over a hero's death. The dead man is a spent force. Accordingly a devotion which can surmount death is postulated; a protection which is not merely ready to sacrifice itself, but is in a position to provide without fail the defence which it promises.

Effectiveness is imperative as well as fidelity, and this is secured by the fact that God brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the Sheep.

(b) But in another connexion Livingness is required, the Livingness which gives the Soul-shepherd the freedom of both worlds, the world here and the world beyond. We do not want one who is of service to us while we are on earth, but who has to be left behind when we pass hence in death. We require a Shepherd who is not earthly, but spiritual, one who can follow (or rather, embrace) our spirit, and shelter it as readily when it is out of the body as when it is in the body. And Christ could not fulfil the office of Lord of dead and living while He was yet in the flesh. He only attained to fulness of Livingness when He had passed through death and had come out victorious

on the other side. This empowered Him to stand with His feet planted firmly on both worlds.

## III.

And yet once again the Good Shepherd must possess *Penetratingness*. That is, he must be able to enter into the hearts and souls of men, in the way of vital fellowship and mystical intimacy. While Jesus was still on earth, it was not possible for men to be 'in Christ' in the sense of 2 Co 5<sup>17</sup>, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,' nor again was it possible for Christ to be 'in' men in the sense of Col 1<sup>27</sup>, 'Christ in you, the hope of glory.' There is no need to dilate upon the impassableness of the inner walls that stand round personality: Christ was fully conscious of it, and it is only the Risen Christ who makes the offer of Rev 3<sup>20</sup>. And thus, while Christ was in the flesh and not yet ascended, He was among men, He was present with them, but He was not in them. He could influence them, but He did not indwell them. He could call them, but He could not satisfy them. Till He had died out of earthly life, He was shut out from their inner lives by remorseless bars. He could not yet give them life and give it more abundantly. He could not enter into them very much more intimately than one mortal man can enter into another; He was by the very nature of things outside them and alone. And this barrier He could annihilate only by His death; what does He say? 'Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit' (Jn 12<sup>24</sup>). Christ died and rose, and the result was immediate. Christ was liberated. He came to the disciples by the Holy Ghost, and dwelt in them with the gifts and powers of Pentecost. The resulting change in the disciples was patent to all. The life which had been concentrated and sealed up in Christ before His death was poured out on them then as richly as when the winter frosts relax their grip upon the fountains and the waters flow again with the returning spring. His own witness to the imprisonment that mortal life constituted for Him may be heard in Lk 12<sup>50</sup>, 'I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!'

Here then we see the Person completed by the Experience. The Soul-shepherd must be Love. But He must be Love that can overstep the centuries and the seas; that possesses the freedom

of the world beyond as of this ; that can pierce within the embattled fortress of human personality.

But we must not allow ourselves to think of the Good Shepherd in terms of devotion and sacrifice only. We tend towards sentimentality in this connexion. He seeks a great deal more than to provide us with consolation ; the matter does not begin and end with a hedonistic satisfaction for the flock. No shepherd of earth tends his sheep simply for the sake of their physical comfort and well-being. He looks further. The flock is kept for the profit of its owner who proposes to 'eat of the milk of the flock.' Even though the shepherd may hazard his life for his sheep, ultimately they must surrender to their owner, some of them their lives, all of them their wool. Is it otherwise here ? The Good Shepherd tends His flock for much more than our private spiritual comfort. He shepherds us for His own high, and often hard, purposes. It is at this point that the allegory breaks down. It is effective only within limits. The relation of the Good Shepherd to human souls is (except in one or two points) altogether beyond that of the shepherd to his sheep. Sheep are mindless creatures, and relation between them and their shepherd there is none, beyond the purely external one of protection on his part, and instinctive response on theirs. All his tending will not bring him and them into closer touch. They stand apart to the end.

But the Good Shepherd tends human souls in order that relation may deepen daily between Him and them, and that relation may ripen into likeness, so that the Shepherd may be reflected in His sheep and be known by men through them. And thus it is that Christ's sheep are tended by Him for His own purposes rather than for their satisfaction. He would have us identify ourselves with these purposes, and seek to be for others what He in His love has been for us. The flock is fed only that it may feed others ; it is died for only that it may die for others. That is to say, the flock itself must develop the shepherd-character and spirit ; the Good Shepherd looks to His flock to do shepherd-work for Him. This truth is involved in the words to which the allegory leads up, 'Other sheep I have . . . them also I must bring.' How does the Shepherd go to bring them ? Through and in His flock. The sheep of the

Good Shepherd must bring in those other sheep. Such is the truth of the mystical union between Christ and His people, that when He would do a thing to-day, He does it through His Church. And if the Church lags, God's work lags. And therefore, when He speaks of Himself as the Good Shepherd, He has declared for ever the character of tenderness and strength which He wishes to see exhibited in His sheep. He wishes each of us to have the shepherd-heart, to reach out shepherd-hands, to seek the wandering with shepherd-feet, and to pour out for their sakes the shepherd-life. 'Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example.'

It was pointed out that the picture breaks down, when the external relation is exhausted. It needs to be supplemented, if the union between Christ and His people is not to be evacuated of its deepest reality. For example, the relation of a shepherd to his flock is mechanical ; that of Christ to His Church is vital. The flock is a collection ; the Church is an organism. The shepherd acts from without ; Christ from within. The shepherd is a living wall, or hand, or eye ; Christ is a beating Heart. And so the picture of the Good Shepherd must be supplemented, or corrected, by that of the Vine and the Branches.

There we have a relation intimate and organic, of the same type as that suggested by the Pauline image of the Head and the Body. So too the picture fails us when we come to the pasturage afforded. The shepherd leads his flock from point to point ; the Good Shepherd says, 'I am the Bread of Life.' The relation is again intimate and vital. Apart from the person of the Good Shepherd there is no sustenance ; 'Without me, ye can do nothing.'

The picture of the Good Shepherd, then, presents much of Christ, but not all. It tells of Love that shrinks from no sacrifice, and of Love that can follow everywhere and substantiate all its promises.

But there is much that it cannot stretch itself to contain. Of those essential elements of Christian experience, namely, attraction into Christ's likeness, membership of Christ, association with a Master-Friend the inner knowledge of whom is spiritual food, it can say nothing. These elements of the integral conception of what Christ is to His Church must be sought elsewhere.

## Literature.

### PENANCE.

THE REV. OSCAR D. WATKINS, M.A., Vicar of S. Cross, Holywell, Oxford, has written *A History of Penance* (Longmans; 42s. net). The book has been published in two handsome octavo volumes. The first volume contains a study of the authorities for the whole Church to A.D. 450; the second for the Western Church from A.D. 450 to A.D. 1215.

What is Penance? It is the power to bind and to loose, the power to remit sins and to retain them. It is that power which the Ascending Lord conferred on His disciples when He breathed on them, and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'

Now it has to be admitted that to many Christians, and even to whole Christian Churches since the Reformation, that commission has been and is still practically a dead letter. They believe, and act steadily on the belief, that no one can forgive sins but God only. To Mr. Watkins it is, next to the Cross, the most significant thing in Christianity. For it is the application to men, and in his sight the only application, of the victory over sin won on the Cross. 'If it be asked,' he says, 'what is the part which men can play in the forgiveness of offence against the majesty of God, it may be answered that in the mysterious wisdom of God it would seem that the fallen human race is required to work out its own redemption. Only as a man will the Divine Word Himself become the Redeemer of the race: and when from Calvary and Hades the risen Lord passes to His place at the right hand of the Father, He leaves upon the earth His chosen officers to apply to the sons of men, each in his several need, the great Atonement which He has wrought for them. When the Lord thus breathes upon the Apostles, He is in the traditional acceptance of the Church to be understood as conveying at that point of time the actual commission which He expresses in words. From that point of time His ministers stand commissioned to remit and to retain the sins of their fellow-men.'

Clearly it is to such a believer a worthy subject for a great book. Mr. Watkins is a historian. He is not a theologian. What the commission in-

volves for theology he does not consider. He is occupied with life. What has it been in the history of the Church?—that is his topic. And that topic he works out with amazing learning. How does a man come to this minute knowledge of the writings of the Fathers?—a knowledge as sure as is the knowledge of Scripture to the best students of the Bible.

Mr. Watkins finds Penance in close contact with Baptism. Is Penance the application of our Lord's commission to those only who have not been baptized, or does it cover also the case of those who have been baptized and have 'fallen from grace'? 'The exercise of the commission in the practice of Penance shows in history the most extraordinary variations. In the first three centuries there is a keen contention as to whether baptized offenders in any of the three capital sins of apostasy, impurity, and bloodshed are or are not admissible to reconciliation in this present life. Hermas (? A.D. 100) indicates that on this point there were already in his time at least two strains of teaching. Some teachers regarded Baptism as the only opportunity of forgiveness for such mortal offences: while others took the view that forgiveness for such offences was readily open even after Baptism. It would seem that a similar tendency to divergence of outlook may be found in the New Testament. The stricter line appears to be taken in the Epistle to the Hebrews: while more lenient practice can be discerned in S. Paul and in S. John. Hermas, while sympathising theoretically with the stricter view, announces a revelation of present mercy to all offending Christians who will repent before a limiting day, a mercy having reference to an imminent persecution and to the approaching end of the age. All the greater writers of the second and early third centuries are found on the side of rigorism. This is the case with Clement of Alexandria, who, however, follows Hermas in mercy to a penitent adulteress: it is no less the case with Hippolytus, with Tertullian, and with Origen. On the other hand, there are bishops of this period who are conspicuous in their advocacy of a more lenient attitude. Such were Dionysius of Corinth; and notably Callistus, who was bishop of Rome from A.D. 218 to A.D. 223. It was to the courageous initiative of Callistus that

was due about the year A.D. 220 the revolution of practice at Rome which admitted the reconciliation of the adulterer, and which in the event will be found to have determined the attitude of the Christian Church in this matter for all future time.'

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGY.

*The Shaping Forces of Modern Religious Thought* is the title which the Rev. Archibald B. D. Alexander, D.D., has given to his new book (Maclehose; 14s. net). It is a good title. But the volume might very well have been called by its sub-title, 'A History of Theological Development.' That is no doubt a higher claim; and because it is higher Dr. Alexander did not make it. Yet is it not too high. This is a history; it is a history of theology since the beginning of the Reformation; it is a history of the development of theology, every doctrine being seen in its relation to other doctrines, and the great scientific law of continuity being clearly and impressively revealed. Dr. Alexander has written only some three or four books; for he is too thorough a scholar to be able to write rapidly; and every book has taken its proper place as the authority on its subject. This is the most authoritative of them all. It is likely to be adopted as a text-book in Colleges; it is sure to be kept within reach of the preacher who is a student.

One of the most distinguishing marks of merit in the new book is the unbiased yet outspoken judgment it pronounces on the great theological movements of the past. Dr. Alexander is unmoved by imperfectly informed opinion of the present day, however great the volume of it. He does justice to Chillingworth as he does justice to Hooker. He does justice to the Puritans as he does justice to the Anglo-Catholics. Here is one representative paragraph: it shows us the historian as we must now insist that the historian ought to be.

'It would be futile to belittle the work of the liberal school, who sought to strike the fetters from the intellect and provide larger room for liberty of worship and religious opinion. But no one can read the works of such men as Hales, Chillingworth and even Jeremy Taylor, and others of this party, without perceiving in what a narrow prescribed area of thought they moved. They have no large horizons. They are occupied for the most part with the little affairs of parochial ecclesi-

asticism. They meant well, and did excellent work in their own day, but their view was limited. Puritanism was something deeper and broader. It dealt with larger issues. As its outward vestments fell away it revealed the strength and vitality of great fundamental principles. The excrescences of Calvinism, the elevation of the few at the expense of the many, which seemed to some to be the characteristic note of the doctrine of Election, passed into oblivion; but the profounder principles of the Sovereignty of God and the sanctity and vocation of the human soul, with all the vital truths connected with these convictions, lived on and became the permanent contribution of this age to its successors. The greatness of Puritanism, in spite of its inconsistencies, which belonged to its age and environment rather than to its essence, lies in its vivid consciousness of God and the spiritual world and the emphasis it placed on the sacredness and purpose of life as entrusted to man by God.'

#### THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

'That the Resurrection holds the place of centrally determinative importance in the Apostolic Church is a fact which, if not always sufficiently realized by the friends of Christianity in subsequent centuries, is at all events acknowledged by her opponents. D. F. Strauss, e.g., the most trenchant and remorseless of her critics, in dealing with the Resurrection acknowledges that it is the "touch-stone not of lives of Jesus only," but of Christianity itself,' that it "touches all Christianity to the quick," and is "decisive for the whole view of Christianity" (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1865, i. 41, 397). And P. W. Schmiedel, after recalling the cardinal Pauline doctrines as determined by his belief in the Resurrection, says: "It seems accordingly in logic inevitable that if at any time it should come to be recognized that the resurrection of Jesus never happened, the Christian faith with respect to all the points just mentioned would necessarily come to an end" (*Encycl. Biblica*, iv. 4039). If this goes, all that is vital and essential in Christianity goes; if this remains, all else remains. So it is that through the centuries, from Celsus onwards, the Resurrection has been the storm centre of the attack upon the Christian faith.

'The character of this attack has varied from age to age. To-day it differs in important respects

from what it was even fifteen or twenty years ago. The application of new and more stringent methods of criticism to the evidence, the rich store of new material provided through recent researches in comparative religion and mythology, the re-discovery of Judaistic apocalyptic literature, and the new interest in the psychology of religion—all this has given “a new face” to the critical attack. It is not, indeed, that the apostolic belief in the resurrection of Christ, or the centrality of this belief to Apostolic Christianity, is denied. These are admitted on all sides as incontestable. What is called in question is the validity of the belief, the historical reality of the fact or facts on which the belief was based. It is held that in the light of the new critical methods applied to the evidence and the new knowledge made accessible to us to-day, in the light of what is generally, though ambiguously, called “modern thought,” it is no longer possible for us to believe in the Resurrection as the apostles believed in it. In particular, in much present-day discussion it is maintained that, in view of modern scientific-historical criticism of the evidence, it is impossible to believe in the resurrection of Christ in any other sense than that of a spiritual resurrection. The result is that to-day we are faced with this somewhat new situation, that not by the opponents of Christianity only but by some of its most honoured supporters and advocates, in their effort to recommend Christianity to the “modern mind,” the bodily resurrection of Christ is denied or minimized as forming no vital or essential part of the Christian faith.’

That is the situation to-day. We have quoted the whole passage from Professor J. M. Shaw’s new book on *The Resurrection of Christ* (T. & T. Clark ; 9s.). The book is a republication of the article ‘Resurrection of Christ’ in the DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, the opportunity being taken to expand and amplify the original article at different points with a view to greater clearness and explicitness of position. That article needs no commendation now.

#### THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The Rev. R. St. John Parry, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, has written an Introduction to and Commentary on *The Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 2os. net). Two things are notable: one that Dr. Parry is a scholar of the first rank, the other that

he believes the Pastoral Epistles to be letters which were written, just as we have them, by the Apostle Paul.

Apart from the Introduction, the Commentary is a distinct accession to our materials for the study of the New Testament. It is on the lines made familiar to us by the great Cambridge commentators of last generation, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort. The outward form is similar; the strong sense of responsibility for the right interpretation of a particle is the same. But there is also advance. The language is now recognized as colloquial, the papyri have been taken account of. Every word is still weighed, but it is weighed with more freedom of movement.

But it is the Introduction that gives the book its significance. Dr. Parry believes that at the end of two years’ imprisonment in Rome, St. Paul was released, that he then went on a new missionary journey as far as Spain, that he wrote the Pastoral Epistles at some place or places in the course of that journey, that he was again arrested (probably at Ephesus), taken back to Rome, and suffered martyrdom at the hands of Nero. The arguments which have been urged against the genuineness of these letters are all taken account of, but not directly. Dr. Parry’s method is to prove the genuineness, not to disprove the spuriousness. He calls us to come to the epistles with open minds and to consider the circumstances, the style, the atmosphere, and see for ourselves that Pauline authorship is possible, is credible, is probable, is sure.

Take the matter of atmosphere—the most telling of all matters. Nairne was quoted *against* in last month’s EXPOSITORY TIMES. Set this beside Nairne: ‘It is not reasonable to expect that a private letter, addressed to a personal friend, for his own instruction and consideration, should exhibit the same features as a letter addressed to a community for public, oral communication. If we ask in particular what differences may be expected, we may say, what may be described as a more uniform and quieter style, an absence of declamation, rhetorical argument, impassioned pleading. And, when the friend is also a trusted companion and disciple, versed in the teaching and story of the writer, we shall not expect the elaboration of the elements or even of the greater themes of that teaching: they will be taken for granted or only alluded to: we shall expect references to the

common experience, and intimacies of mutual knowledge. Moreover such a letter will deal directly with the immediate situation: it will leave much untold just because present to the minds of both writer and reader: it will have a large background as clear to them as it is obscure to us. Thus the difference of address will materially affect both the manner and the matter. If these letters closely resembled the earlier letters they would thereby betray the hand of the imitator.

'For many readers it is probably the general impression derived from reading those epistles consecutively after one of the others which gives the feeling that we are in presence of a different writer. But it is just this general difference which is most directly due to the change of address. It is not too much to say that the impression could have been scarcely less strong if these epistles had dealt with the same subjects as those, for instance, of Galatians or Corinthians, but had been addressed to Silvanus or Titus, for their direction in dealing with those Churches. Indeed if we could have possessed such a private letter to compare with the public letters on the same theme the differences in style and expression might easily have been still more startling.'

#### THE LOLLARD BIBLE.

The Cambridge University Press has undertaken the issue of an important series of works under the editorship of Mr. G. G. Coulton. What is the purpose? Let Mr. Coulton tell us:

'There is only too much truth in the frequent complaint that history, as compared with the physical sciences, is neglected by the modern public. But historians have the remedy in their own hands; choosing problems of equal importance to those of the scientist, and treating them with equal accuracy, they will command equal attention. Those who insist that the proportion of accurately ascertainable facts is smaller in history, and therefore the room for speculation wider, do not thereby establish any essential distinction between truth-seeking in history and truth-seeking in chemistry. The historian, whatever be his subject, is as definitely bound as the chemist "to proclaim certainties as certain, falsehoods as false, and uncertainties as dubious." Those are the words, not of a modern scientist, but of the seventeenth-century monk, Jean Mabillon; they sum up his literary profession of faith. Men will

follow us in history as implicitly as they follow the chemist, if only we will form the chemist's habit of marking clearly where our facts end and our inferences begin. Then the public, so far from discouraging our speculations, will most heartily encourage them; for the most positive man of science is always grateful to anyone who, by putting forward a working theory, stimulates further discussion.'

The first volume has been written by Margaret Deanesly, M.A., Mary Bateson Fellow of Newnham College. Its subject is *The Lollard Bible and other Medieval Biblical Versions* (31s. 6d. net). It is a volume of five hundred octavo pages—attractive, scholarly, thorough—the most important work on the English Bible which has been issued for many a day. Miss Deanesly handles her 'monstrous regiment' of facts without feeling of exhaustion or appearance of effort. One reads the book with increasing enjoyment and with deepening interest right on to the end. It is good to have already some knowledge of the English Versions, but it is not necessary.

Among the curious facts clearly brought out is this. There was some consciousness that the reading of the Gospels in a tongue *not* 'understood of the people' needed explanation. The explanation given in one of the early mass-books, the *Merita Missae* is that merely to hear the reading is edifying though it is not understood, 'just as an adder is affected by the charm pronounced over her, though she does not understand the words.'

Though ye understand it nought,  
Ye well may wit that God it wrought,

And therefore wisdom were it,  
For worship all God's works,  
To lewid men that been none clerkes:

This lesson, now go lere it.

And why ye should this lesson lere,  
Hearkneth all and ye may hear:

There an adder hauntes,  
Ye well may find, and ye will seek,  
She understands nothing thy speech,

When thou her endauntes:

Nevertheless, she wots full well  
What is thy meaning every deal;

When that thou her enchantes,  
So fareth there understanding fails,  
The very virtue you all avails,

Through grace that God you grantes.'

### HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND.

Canon Wilfrid Richmond has given himself to the thankful task of editing the work left by Professor Scott Holland unpublished at his death. Two distinct books have been issued in one volume, demanding the double title: *The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel* (Murray; 12s. net).

To take the last first. The contribution to the study of the Fourth Gospel consists of two Introductions. They were written at different times and they express different conceptions of the Gospel, but they have to be read together if Scott Holland's mind is to be understood. And Mr. Richmond is more concerned that we should understand Scott Holland's mind than that we should understand the Fourth Gospel. Nevertheless these Introductions are good for the understanding of the Gospel. They may give some readers their first firm footing in respect of the authorship of it, they will give every reader new understanding of its majesty.

The first part of the volume is an exposition of Scott Holland's theology. Canon Richmond has used his published works (almost all volumes of sermons), including sermons published in the *Christian World Pulpit*, and in a masterly way he has quoted from them, introducing his own hand as rarely as possible, and so arranging the quotations that we see quite clearly and instructively what were the beliefs on which Scott Holland lived and died.

### THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL.

It is a firm principle in historical writing that the history of a movement should be written by one who is in sympathy with it. The Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M.A., who writes the history of *The Evangelical Revival* (Methuen; 16s. net), is not in sympathy. The consequence is a perpetual sense of irritation. Nothing is right. All the seamy side is turned up. And the reader at last concludes that the Evangelical Revival was the sorriest effort of men and women to follow the mind of Christ in all the history of Christianity—if Mr. Baring-Gould is a faithful and true historian.

Now it may be admitted that the Evangelical Revival needed a sympathetic historian. It has also to be admitted, however, from the other side, that few movements repay sympathetic treatment

better. Why, then, did Mr. Baring-Gould undertake to write its history? Partly, we think, because he has an interest in psychology as it is to be studied on its religious side, but chiefly because he desired to show that the hymn is all wrong which says that 'God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform.' He moves, Mr. Baring-Gould believes, in a perfectly natural straightforward businesslike way, and has no wonders whatever to perform. In older days he would have used strong words of 'enthusiasm'; in these days he uses strong words of 'abnormal spiritual phenomena.' All is to him normal and natural. Conversion 'is no miracle, it is a produce of natural processes, the materials have been accumulating since infancy. We do not dispute that it is God who is the cause; for He made man, and gave to his spirit the faculty of incubation of all that is necessary for the final explosion.' 'To entertain the idea, so general in Wesleyanism, that Conversion is due to the miraculous interposition of God, to a sudden descent of the Holy Spirit on a man, instantaneously changing his heart, is not in accordance with psychology. We know that all the elements conducing to this phenomenon have been accumulating and ripening for the convulsion.'

### LAFAYETTE.

To their excellent and successful series 'The "True" Biographies and Histories,' Messrs. Lippincott have added a volume on Lafayette. The title is *The True La Fayette* (10s. 6d.). The author is Mr. George Morgan.

It is a volume of nearly five hundred pages, and it is fully furnished with index and illustrations—quite enough to show the world how grateful even yet the American nation is to the wealthy French aristocrat who threw himself and his money into their struggle for democratic freedom. Mr. Morgan writes with a grave sense of the importance of his subject. His admiration for Lafayette is able to lift him over all the difficult places in his career. He has too high a feeling for the grandeur of biography to deny the existence of faults and failings. But they disappear in the general greatness of the man, his disinterestedness, his loyalty to the cause which it seemed so impossible that he could ever really believe in. How much of his enthusiasm was due to sheer love of adventure, and how much to sheer hatred of the British, is as impossible now to estimate as it is needless.

The volume is national. It is a nation's offering to one whom it will always delight to honour. It is a full commentary on the words of General Pershing at Lafayette's tomb. 'One may be pardoned for recalling the exact circumstances of the incident referred to. The situation was simple. All clouds, all complexities (if not all doubts) had been swept away when the United States resolved to strike for the liberties of mankind. The enemy, by reason of enormous successes in the East, was concentrating in the West. His submarines were in the full fiendishness of their activity. Then it was that General John J. Pershing, Commander-in-chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, having arrived in France with the vanguard of our overseas army of two millions of men, made a pilgrimage in Paris to Picpus Cemetery and, standing by one of the tombs, said reverently: "*La Fayette, we are here!*" That utterance—those four words—meant much to us and a great deal to the hard-pressed French. One meaning was that we were about to pay something of our inextinguishable debt to France. Another meaning was that America, with its three millions in young La Fayette's time, had enlisted, with its one hundred millions, in the very cause La Fayette had championed.'

'A Brief Account of the Freudian Theory,' called *Psycho-Analysis* has been given by Miss Barbara Low, B.A. (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). It is also an intelligible account—no small achievement. The style is simple and the examples are numerous. What Psycho-Analysis means no one need any longer be ignorant of. Miss Low is no doubt keen to make converts, for she is an ardent disciple of Freud. And there is no reason why she should not make them. There is no pseudo-scientific occultism here. There is no danger to the balance of the mind. Rather is there healing and help in this scientific exposition of the ways of 'the Unconscious.' And there is sometimes a wholesome humour. 'As an instance of the Unconscious working through a so-called "slip of the tongue," Freud gives us this case: a doctor, who had been treating a wealthy patient, now convalescent, began cheering her with the prospect of an expedition to the country very soon, and the pleasures she might look forward to, ending up with, "You will be able to have a very pleasant

time if, as I hope, you will *not* soon be able to leave your bed."

The Christian life is a life of progress, and the progress is a process of letting go and holding on. Some things we let go. What are they? Dr. Anna Robertson Brown says they are pretence, worry, discontent, and self-seeking. What are the things we keep hold of? They are work, happiness, common duties, friendship, sorrow, faith. It is all fully set forth in one of Mr. Allenson's 'Heart and Life' booklets entitled *What is Worth While?* (1s. net).

The wise pastor is the pastor of the children. The Rev. H. G. Tunnicliff, B.A., gives the best of his brains and the tenderest of his sympathies to the feeding of the lambs. He will be rewarded. After issuing three or four volumes of children's sermons he has become ambitious and has published a new Children's Pilgrim's Progress, calling it *The Road of Adventures* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net).

There is not a children's address that is more effective than the parable. It catches the attention, it remains in the memory, it carries its lesson home. If only it were easier to tell a parable. The Rev. W. T. Tutton has the gift. He is short, simple, direct, natural. His book of parables called *The Box and the Bird* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net) is good for reading as well as for preaching.

The importance of the Comparative Study of Religions is being recognized at last. Missionaries have discovered that the first demand made upon them is to understand the religion they have gone to supersede. Preachers at home have learned that nothing has been more effective in winning their most intelligent young people away than the popular belief, so industriously advocated in press and on platform, that one religion is just as good as another. One of the signs of the awakening is the circulation of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Another is the issue of an 'Introduction to the Study of Religions,' by Principal A. E. Garvie of New College, London. It is an excellent book for the purpose. To the missionary it will be especially instructive. And it is written with ample knowledge and enthusiasm. The title is *Tutors unto Christ* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net).

Why do we behave well? Mr. Stephen Ward does not deny that we do, sometimes. Why? He answers, Because we have one natural endowment called Activity, and we learn to exercise it in a way that is good—good for others and so for ourselves. Knowledge, then, applied to Activity—that is the way.

And in that way we make progress. The whole world makes progress. 'It is not fifty years ago that Queen Victoria wrote of the women who advocated female suffrage—a mild and unobtrusive body in those days—that they ought to be whipped. That is, a hard-working and high-principled lady saw nothing shocking in advocating such punishment for her own sex on account of a harmless doctrine. To-day, most of us are eager to accommodate; we are not so sure we are right, or that there is only one way of doing things. But this is not the consequence of greater morality; we hesitate to speak on this matter with the conviction of our fathers. It is due to greater enlightenment, greater common sense.'

Mr. Ward does not altogether ignore Christ. 'With an originality striking in his own time and circumstances he seized upon a salient characteristic of human nature, the mutual give and take whereby men live in harmony. By an arrangement with his master's debtors the unjust steward contrives that in the event of his dismissal he shall fall upon his feet.' But he must look at Christ again. His book is *The Ways of Life: A Study in Ethics* (Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Dent have reissued Mr. Clement K. Shorter's book on 'George Borrow and his Circle' in their Wayfarer's Library and have given it the title of *The Life of George Borrow* (2s. net), thereby pleasing the author and increasing the number of his readers. And the book is well worthy both of its place in this series and of its new name. The two-volume life of Borrow by Dr. Knapp is far from satisfactory, as Mr. Shorter himself makes very manifest. We demand to know every man at his best, not at his worst. And with this man the best and the worst were far apart.

All that is known, and all that needs to be known, about *Girls' Clubs, their Organization and Management*, is contained in Miss Helen J. Ferris's book with that title (Dent; 8s. net). It is an American book, by an American author, and it is

American through and through. But that only serves to make it complete and suggestive. For Girls' Clubs are a great institution in the United States of America, and all the rest of the world must sit at the feet of the American 'Leader' and be taught. Moreover, there is a future to be prepared for, a future with momentous possibilities. Very business-like is Miss Ferris throughout. There is plenty of fun, but there is no silliness. The very illustrations are an education in the fulness, the freedom, and the responsibility of girl life.

He would be a foolish Roman, and he would be a more foolish Protestant, who took exception to Mr. J. E. Rattenbury's *Roman Errors and Protestant Truths* (Epworth Press; 2s. net). For the tone of the book is beyond cavil, as the facts it contains are beyond controversy.

*The Problem of Christian Ethics* (Epworth Press; 3s.)—is not that the problem of our time? For the question for us is not what we should do, but why we should do it. And that brings in Christianity. Why should we do this and refrain from that? The answer is because God requires it of us, and God is seen in the face of Jesus-Christ. That is why we urge religion upon men, that is why we urge the Christian religion. The Rev. Ernest W. Young, M.A., has brought it all out most attractively in his Thesis with that title, and he has sent it home to our heart and conscience by many a well-chosen literary illustration.

Mr. F. W. Boreham's new book is entitled *A Bunch of Everlastings* (Epworth Press; 6s. net). It is described openly on the title-page as 'a volume of sermons.' Is Mr. Boreham able to preach such sermons as these—exactly as they are printed here—and is his congregation able to receive them? Their interest is undoubted and even intense. For Mr. Boreham is an artist. Thoughts are not thrown down as they occur, nor are they clothed in the words that they happen to catch hold of. Every sermon is constructed. Every thought is in its place and properly expressed. And there are no marks left of the constructing. To the literary student as to the average hearer of sermons every sermon is literature. And every sermon is more.

For in every sermon the Gospel is contained. And yet more. In every sermon the Gospel is sent home to heart and to conscience with quite unusual force. The end of preaching is persuasion, and that end is not for one moment forgotten by Mr. Boreham. Oh yes, he preached these sermons, and you or I could preach them, if only they were ours.

This volume is occupied entirely with the texts which were the power of God unto salvation of certain great men—Thomas Chalmers's Text, Martin Luther's Text, and all the rest.

Mr. G. Watt Smith, M.A., has begun with the Nineteenth Century and gone back, century after century, to the First, showing popularly who were the great men and what the characteristics of each century since Christ came. His title is *Men and Marks of the Christian Era* (Gardner). The Nineteenth Century was the century of Science, its great men were James Watt and Sir James Simpson. The Fifteenth Century was the century of the Printing Press. Its leading men were John Hus, Jerome of Prague, Fust, Gutenberg, and Savonarola.

The Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia has in hand a series of volumes describing 'Movements in Judaism.' 'Zionism,' by Professor Gottheil, has already been published. Now *Hellenism*, by Dr. Norman Bentwich, is out. Others to follow are 'Mysticism,' by Chief Rabbi Hertz; 'Rationalism,' by Dr. Isaac Husik; and 'Reform Judaism,' by Dr. Schulman.

The volume on Hellenism is as necessary as any of them. For Dr. Bentwich's subject is not Hellenism in its influence on Christ or St. Paul, though that also is in some need of exposition. It is Hellenism as representing the culture of the ancient world in its conflict with and its entrance into Rabbinic Judaism, a much more rarely discussed subject. So the value of the book is first of all for the student of Judaism. And Dr. Bentwich is an unbiassed guide who knows the way. He writes as an historian, not as an apologist. But the value of the book does not end there. It is, after all, the student of the Pauline Epistles who will find most profit in it. Here is one expressive sentence: 'The mission of Paul marks the radical conversion of the ethical Hebraic teaching of Jesus into a new Hellenistic religion, in which the

theology of the advanced Alexandrian reformers takes the place of the life according to the Jewish law as the basis of union. "The letter which is the law kills and leads to death. The spirit which is the Lord gives life and leads Godwards."

It never rains but it pours—Commentaries. We all know that Canon Charles has finished a Commentary on the Apocalypse for the 'International Critical' series—a Commentary which is to be issued immediately in two volumes. Only a month ago a handsome volume came from America, mostly of Introduction. This month we have *The Revelation of John* (Johnson; 6s. net) by Professor A. S. Peake, both Introduction and Commentary and a work of the first importance.

Professor Peake chose the Apocalypse when invited to deliver the nineteenth Hartley Lecture. Now the Hartley Lecture, if we mistake not, is delivered at a sitting, whereas this is a volume of four hundred pages. What is the meaning of it? The meaning of it is that the book contains a full introduction as well as a fairly full exposition of the Book of Revelation, and yet has all the 'readableness' of the popular lecture.

It is enough to add that until Charles comes Peake tells us all that is known about the Apocalypse. Scholarship and Sanity—both in full flower—these are its characteristics.

Platform speakers, in order to get into touch with their audience, used to begin by denouncing the Devil. The writers of books have caught the trick. Their Devil is John Calvin. It is enough to mention the name. From Catholic to Quaker, Calvin and Calvinism have for a generation been the anathema of anathemas. And now a Christian and a scholar, the Rev. A. Mitchell Hunter, M.A., has the audacity to write a great book on *The Teaching of Calvin* (Maclehose; 10s. 6d. net).

A great book? You have not often, in theology, stumbled upon a greater. Mr. Hunter is master of a gloriously masterful style—clear as crystal, momentous as a steam engine. If he had been a writer of literary essays all the critics would have called his book great. Much more than that, he is a writer on a subject which itself is great—he proves it to be great—one of the greatest ever occupying the attention of man's mind, and he rises to the greatness of it.

He is not a slavish Calvinist. Who could be? Who could be a slavish Augustinian, or even a slavish Newmanite? In one generation we can go higher than any man has gone. How much more in four centuries! But he does this for Calvin. He makes it impossible for any man to speak disrespectfully of his head or his heart. And he does this for Calvinism. He makes it dangerous for any man to mention the word, on platform or in press, until he has read and reckoned with this book.

Professor R. M. Maciver, D.Phil. of the University of Toronto, wrote his book *Community* (Macmillan) to prove that sociology is a science. The book has already reached a second edition, and in the preface to that edition he avows that purpose is an unmistakable challenge. 'Is sociology a real science, or only a bundle of snippets hung on a thread of good intentions? I hold it to be a real science, still in its infancy. And this book is to be judged by its degree of success in suggesting the subject-matter of that science. If its contents can be divided up so that this part can be assigned to psychology, this to economics, this to politics, and so on, then the quest has been in vain.'

It has not been in vain. The reviewers have approved of the book, the buyers of books have bought it, its readers have discovered a new science and rejoiced in the discovery. As an introduction to the study of the science of Sociology the book will not easily be surpassed.

Mr. Owen Wister is a citizen of the United States of America and he has quite a good opinion of his country and people. 'Owing to one thing and another we are cleaner, honest, humbler, and whiter than any people on the continent of Europe. If any nation on the continent of Europe has ever behaved with the generosity and magnanimity that we have shown to Cuba, I have yet to learn of it. They jeered at us about Cuba, did the Europeans of the continent. Their papers stuck their tongues in their cheeks. Of course our fine sentiments were all sham, they said. Of course we intended to swallow Cuba, and never had intended anything else. And when General Leonard Wood came away from Cuba, having made Havana healthy, having brought order out of chaos on the island, and we left Cuba inde-

pendent, Europe jeered on. That dear old Europe!'

Is his book then simply a glorifying of ourselves? It is nothing of the sort. What we have quoted from it is there to show the American people how needless it is of them (being so great) to be jealous of the people of Great Britain. The title is *A Straight Deal; or, The Ancient Grudge* (Macmillan; 6s. net). It is a forcibly written, highly courageous, and firmly patriotic book.

Last month was noticed here a great book on China by the late James W. Bashford, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This month there comes out a volume of sermons and addresses by Bishop Bashford. Most of its contents are addressed to students in training for the ministry. And even the more apparently popular discourse is likely to be most profitable to preachers. This seems to have been the call to which Bishop Bashford responded. He determined not merely himself to discover 'latent saints,' as Christina Rossetti would say, but to send saints out in the discovery of other saints. If he addresses theological students, it is never to make them theologians: always is it to make them witnesses. If he preaches an apparently popular sermon it is to make every man and woman who hears him a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. The volume contains twelve full thoughtful stirring discourses. Its title is *The Demand for Christ* (Methodist Book Concern; \$1.50 net).

One of the essays in Professor Henry C. Sheldon's volume of 'Essays in Philosophy and Religion,' entitled *Pantheistic Dilemmas* (Methodist Book Concern; \$2.50 net), is concerned with the truth and error of Mysticism. And, as is the way with writers on Mysticism, Professor Sheldon gives a list of definitions. It has the usual result. Not two of the writers agree together. One man says it is 'the assertion of an intuition which transcends the temporal categories of the understanding.' Another says it is a belief in a God who answers prayer. Dr. Sheldon's own definition is this: 'Mysticism stands first of all for a very pronounced theory and faith relative to the possibilities of intercommunion between the soul and God; secondarily it stands for a very pronounced theory and faith respecting the significance of nature as the veil, robe, or symbolical expression.

of a transcendent reality? The essay is then an exposition of the first part of that definition, the second part being used as introduction to it.

The volume is made up of essays that are independent but all concerned with living issues. There is one on Pragmatism and another on Bergsonism (if that word is lawful) which will give the beginner in the study of modern philosophy a very fair idea of those two isms. Dr. Sheldon is a severe critic of both systems.

What is Christianity? Mr. Carl K. Mahoney says it is one of two things. Either it is 'that set of teachings promulgated by Jesus Christ and his disciples, especially those of Christ himself, and embodied in the New Testament Scriptures.' Or it is 'the social organism growing out of the movement started by Christ in the world, an organism seeking to follow in its development the principles that he taught, and striving, with a greater or less measure of success, to attain unto the standards of life which he set up.' Now it is certain—it ought to be certain by this time—that Christianity is neither the one nor the other. Christianity is Christ. A man may accept the teachings of Christ and try to live by them; he may also be a loyal member of the Church of Christ; and yet he may not be a Christian. To be a Christian is to have Christ in the heart by faith. Why, then, does Mr. Mahoney limit his definition to the teaching and the social organism? Because he is a psychologist and his purpose in the book entitled *Social Evolution and the Development of Religion* (Methodist Book Concern; \$1.25) is 'to present the results of a study of religion from the standpoint of social psychology.' Now 'the psychologist in the field of religion does not discuss the supernatural at length because it lies without his province. It lies in the realm of the theologian.' Well, it is all right and excellent as an adjunct. But it is not, and Mr. Mahoney knows that it is not, Christianity. Listen to this: 'Too much is made of Greek and Roman influences upon the growth of Christianity. Not enough has been made of those influences that had their genesis in the personal life of Jesus Christ, that sprang fresh and new from the depth of his being. Out of his personal life came the determinative dynamic elements and factors of the Christian religion and its development.'

Primary Visitation Charges are not as a rule exhilarating reading. But the charge given by Lord William Cecil on his primary visitation of the Diocese of Exeter will both stimulate and astonish. Dullness?—there is not a dull sentence in it. The Bishop gives expression to every thought of his heart, and the thoughts of Lord William Cecil's heart are very active and even revolutionary. First comes the subject of 'The Temporalities of the Church.' He says: 'I should like the funds of the diocese to be regarded as belonging to the diocese and not to individual parishes, and I would not exclude either the incomes of the capitular bodies or the Episcopate. Out of that fund the incomes should be from time to time distributed according to the needs of the diocese. The incomes of the Canons might be transferred to the Archdeacons. For I am convinced that endowed Archdeaconries would contribute far more to the efficiency of the Church than any increase in the Episcopate. I would even like to see the income of the Deans apportioned to the Suffragan Bishops. Suffragan Bishops have, as a rule, no endowment while Archdeacons receive sums which barely pay their expenses. Yet on the splendid work of the Suffragan and the Archdeacons the whole efficiency of the Church depends.'

Is that all? There is more than that. 'I have every regard for the Cathedral Chapters, but we cannot truthfully say that their office is in any way indispensable to the Church. If they adorn the Church it is from their own intrinsic merits. I cannot see why such a reasonable reform as to unite the offices of Archdeacon and Canon, and by leaving the Bishop to be his own Dean as he is in many dioceses to use the income of the Deanery to supply a Suffragan, should be regarded as a radical measure, due regard being paid to all life interests. I will not touch on the income of the Episcopate as it would seem to be a personal subject, but I will merely say that in any scheme of a Redistribution Fund the Episcopal incomes would have to be redistributed with the rest. But I am on sure ground when I say that such a measure would augment the usefulness of the Church in the parishes. We should get a body of well-paid men doing adequate work; unburdened with the sense of poverty, they could throw their whole energies into that which they have chosen as their life's work, preaching the Gospel.'

This Charge will be read. Its title is *Difficulties and Duties* (Nisbet; 4s. 6d. net).

*The Way of Health*, by Charles W. Budden, M.D. (Pilgrim Press; 4s. net), is further described as 'Plain Counsels in Personal Hygiene.' And so far there is nothing likely to catch the attention of the man or woman who turns over the books on the bookseller's counter. A glance inside, however, discovers coloured illustrations, clever enough to arrest the eye, and mysterious enough to insist on further examination. The reading of the book follows. And then the surprised and delighted reader is found wondering why these things, so necessary that he should be aware of, and so imperative that he should attend to, if he is to do his work in the world, were not taught him at school, and made part of the daily and hourly practice of his life. Dr. Budden has a rare gift, or rather combination of gifts. He knows his subject practically and he can impart his knowledge most persuasively. We would encourage him to write yet another book on the body—a full and serviceable manual of health to be used by teachers. But for the instruction of the average man or woman this book could scarcely be surpassed.

For the better attendance at Holy Communion, and especially for the greater profit of that attendance, the Rev. Cecil J. Cheshire, M.A., has written a convenient manual of devotion, calling it *Holy Communion on Holy Days and Saints' Days* (Scott; 4s. net). He believes that we profit best when we obtain a single leading thought out of the Scripture Lesson and then turn that thought into the three great purposes of a Eucharist-Adoration or thanksgiving, Supplication or pleading the merits of the Cross, and Prayer for special grace, whether for ourselves or for others. His aim is to suggest the leading thought. And in that aim he is sure to be successful, if we use his little book with the sincerity it deserves.

Messrs. Scribner have issued an edition in America of Professor H. A. A. Kennedy's *The Theology of the Epistles* (\$1.35). The book has already been reviewed. But it is right to say that the American is more attractive than the English edition.

Mr. Henry J. Cadbury holds that the Old

Testament is the literature of the Hebrew nation, and that the Hebrew nation came into existence as a fusion of Israelites and Amorites (called also Canaanites). His interest is not in the wars and migrations which brought the Hebrew nation into existence. It is in the ideals which the nation held and which made it so great a power, though so small a people, in the history of the world.

There are three ways of regarding the history of the world. It may be looked upon as the unfolding of a Divine plan which man is powerless to alter: that is the apocalyptic way. It may be regarded as the playground of material forces—economic, military, political: that is the materialistic way. It may be considered as the operation of spiritual forces and ideals: the spiritual way. Mr. Cadbury believes that the history of the Hebrews, as it is found in the Old Testament, is the best example of the third way which the world has seen. And it is his endeavour in the book entitled *National Ideals in the Old Testament* (Scribners; \$1.75) to describe these ideals and to estimate their value for mankind. There is a certain freshness, if not originality, in the conception: in the working out of it there is an undeniable originality, and that not of words but of thought and stimulus to thought.

Messrs. Scribner are the publishers of a volume on the *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth* (\$2) written by Albert Edward Bailey, Director of Religious Education in Worcester Academy, and Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Litt.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University—a volume of scholarship and practical value. Its practical value as a teacher's handbook to the Old Testament is evident in the turning of its pages. On every other page there is a clear reproduction of some ancient tablet or modern photograph, illustrating the narrative in which it is set, and at once making that narrative alive with intelligence. A glance at the end of the book confirms the impression of its usefulness. There we discover eight-and-twenty maps, coloured in the most eye-arresting manner, and absolutely up to date in accuracy. As the story is told, the pupil is plied with questions. They also are practical and up to date. Below a number of photographs from the monuments of Aramean, Hittite, Hebrew, and other faces, we find this list: 'What similarities of feature do you discover in these types? Is there

any especially intellectual countenance? Are there any evidences of refinement or spirituality? Are any of the men strong-willed? Are any physical weaklings? Pick out specimens that are fit to be world conquerors. Any that would make religious fanatics. Imagine these men living in America to-day: what kinds of citizens would they become, and what would be their probable occupations?' Perhaps Director Bailey and Professor Foster will publish the answers of the smart American boy.

On the 24th day of June 1908, at one of the sittings of the Pan-Anglican Congress, a special offering was made for Foreign Missions. The sum contributed was £352,000. How was that sum spent? The whole story is told in *The Spending of a Thank-Offering*, a handsome illustrated volume, edited by Aubrey Baskerville Mynors, M.A., and published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (4s. cloth, 2s. 6d. paper, net).

Mr. Arthur Herald's *Essays in Moderation* (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net) are chiefly essays in Utopianism. The last half of the book is deliberately given to the description of a perfect State. Only the first essay deals directly with Moderation. It is a sermon on the text, 'Let your moderation be known unto all men' (Ph 4<sup>5</sup>). Mr. Herald takes

the word to mean 'a proper sense of proportion' or the putting of first things first.

'One great weakness of the churches at the present time is that we are still groping after a theology which is at once simple and profound, loyal to the historic revelation and loyal to the manifestations of truth in modern science—a theology which would interpret life's meaning and purpose as clearly as Calvinism used to do or as Marxism does—a theology which will satisfy the mind and stir the heart—a theology that can be preached.'

The Rev. Herbert G. Wood, M.A., does not profess to supply this theology or to be able to supply it. But in the Swarthmore Lecture for 1920 on *Quakerism and the Future of the Church* (Swarthmore Press; 1s. 6d. net) he does very clearly open the way for it. He shows that 'all the leading ideas of the older theology have broken down in the form in which they used to be presented. The idea of the sovereignty of God and of predestination and election have to be reshaped. The doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, of a substitutionary Atonement and of Eternal Punishment are no longer believed and can no longer be preached. The popular conception of the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures can no longer be maintained.' But he shows just as clearly that the theologian who tosses all these doctrines aside and offers no substitute for them is not the theologian that we are in search of.

## Nicodemus.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE STEVEN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

IT is of importance for the understanding of this story that we keep in mind throughout the position of Nicodemus and the high esteem in which he must have been held by his fellow-countrymen. He was not only a man of education and blameless character, but of such marked ability that he had been chosen a member of the Sanhedrim, the highest civil and ecclesiastical court of the land. This position of honour and influence it was his duty to maintain. It has been customary to despise him for visiting Jesus under cover of the darkness, yet there are not many men among us of

high place and repute who would not shrink from what they might think was compromising themselves by showing openly an interest in a movement which was limited to the lower classes, and was said by the more influential people of the time to be subversive of the national faith.

It is of importance also that we have a clear conception of the motive which led Nicodemus to visit Jesus at all. As is manifest from the Gospels, our Lord's work and teaching were causing great discussions everywhere, and Nicodemus may have taken part in them. At any rate he confessed he

knew what they were; and had formed his own conclusions about them. Many motives have been ascribed to him of one kind or another, but I am inclined to believe from the turn of the conversation that he was moved by a purely intellectual curiosity, which Jesus with His unerring intuition into human character perceived at once. Nicodemus wished to understand what this new movement meant, wished to get to the heart of it, to study it and to study it at the source. Moreover, he knew that a private conversation was the best method of attaining his object. Yet his high position and his sense that he was stooping from it were against his getting at any real comprehension of Jesus. Very few men of education and refinement can lightly put aside what it has cost them a whole lifetime to build up, so as to listen with an open mind to what a young working-man from a country village has got to say about the very subject which they have studied most deeply. In addition to that, the very religion of the Pharisee would make it difficult for him to listen with appreciation to the new teaching. He had been trained from his earliest days in the law, to believe that men were saved by strict obedience to commandments, to reverence the traditions of the elders, to shape his whole conduct by a complicated system of rules. He therefore had an idea of God which closed his mind against the free spirit of Jesus. And a false idea is as blinding as sin. Now an intellectual interest in religious movements is attractive, even fascinating, and wholly legitimate, but to come with a prejudiced mind to the study of anything, not to speak of religion, prevents any intimate knowledge of it. I suspect that Nicodemus, while he was interested, was, like other Pharisees, wholly satisfied that the law was the only divine means of saving a man's soul. And to be satisfied with our religious attainments is fatal.

Through the dark streets of Jerusalem Nicodemus stole along until he reached the house where Jesus lodged. He entered, and was in the presence of the Son of God. Sitting in the dimly lit room, they talked together, while the wind blew where it listed, and they heard the sound of it beating on the casement. Nicodemus opened the conversation, and, we may frankly admit, opened it diplomatically by a kindly reference to Jesus' teaching and work, 'We know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these signs thou doest except God be with him.' It would have been easy for

Jesus, if He had been so minded, to lead on from the vantage ground thus given Him to deeper matters. He had done so with Simon the son of Jonas, when, taking him at his best, He called the impulsive man of action a 'rock'—no longer impulsive but immovable. He had done so also with Nathanael the mystic, and had promised him still richer visions than those he had had under the fig-tree, yet steadied them by resting them all on the fact of the Son of man. Why then did He pull Nicodemus up sharp, preventing him from even so much as putting the question he had come to ask? Was there something in his manner or in his tone that revealed him? Or was the man sincere who said that Jesus was a teacher come from God, and yet could not talk with Him in broad daylight? Whatever it was that moved him, our Lord at once checked the speech by what seems an irrelevant reply: 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' This would seem to mean: 'There is no use of our discussing the matter, for we have no common ground to go upon; no one can discuss it until he has had experience of it: it is a matter not for discussing, but for inward seeing.' As we are all aware there are certain facts in life which cannot be explained, because they are ultimate facts and must simply be accepted—such as life, love, fear, hope; we cannot analyse them. An illustration or two will bring the truth of this home to our minds. Take a landscape. Have you ever been in the presence of a fine sunset, and at the same time in the company of one who had no sense of beauty? You speak to him of what you see and feel, of what moves you deeply, and he answers you that he does not understand your emotion. You do not argue the matter with him, you only regret that your friend is beauty-blind. A company were once sailing up one of the famous rivers of America, and some of them were breaking out from time to time in admiration of the splendour of the scene that was passing before them. A wealthy American was of the number, who after listening for a time cried out: 'What are you all raving about?' Then sweeping his arm across the scene, added: 'I would not give fifty dollars for five miles of it.' The others were silent, and one of them who told the story was sorry for the poor creature. The man did not see it—that was all, but how much it was! Turner, the famous painter was busy painting a picture in the presence of a lady friend, who kept watching

nd comparing the landscape and the picture as it took shape under Turner's creative hand. At last she exclaimed, 'Mr. Turner, I don't see that!' He stopped, looked at her for a moment, and answered, 'But, madam, don't you wish you could?' His question rendered debate needless. It is the same with music and with poetry. What thrills one soul leaves another cold. 'Daffodils, That come before the swallow dares and take The winds of March with beauty,'—these words of Shakespeare will be nothing particular to one man, and will haunt the mind of another for ever. There is something even more marvellous than these. There are men and women among us to-night who love most of all the friendless, the degraded, and the lost souls of your city, who are restless in their own comforts, who have felt the fascination of Home Mission work, and give their time, their strength, their all to save them. As men of the world observe them, they are amazed or amused, counting it hopeless work. The reason is they have not been quickened by the divine power of Christ's compassion for men, and have not had their eyes anointed with salve so as to see the loveliness of a life redeemed. It seems to me that it was for some such reason as this that our Lord declined to enter on any discussion with Nicodemus concerning this new religious movement, in which he showed a keen intellectual interest, saying in as many words: 'You do not see or feel or grasp the meaning and power and beauty of My message.' If Christ were here among us to-night, as in very truth He is, what would He ask? Do we feel the charm of a holy life, or see the loveliness of a meek and chastened spirit, or desire the humility that is pleased enough to be overlooked in a congregation which we have served for years? Are we pained by a story of sin, wounded by the sight of pride or greed in a good man, shocked by a cry for retaliation or by a sneer at a pure life? If these things are true of us, would He not say: 'Then verily, you are born again'?

Nicodemus was puzzled by this new view of his relation to God, and asked: 'How can a man be born when he is old? How can these things be?' That question does not seem to me a silly one. It would appear rather that the whole Christian world has, in one form or another, been trying to answer it ever since the night Christ spoke. And never have men highly skilled in mental science been so busy with the problem as they are to-day. It is

quite true we cannot solve it, but we can at least try to understand it, if it be only a little. To be born again, as our Lord said that night, is to be born of the Spirit, and the Spirit of the living God is God dealing with us, thinking of us, seeking us, persuading us, working in us. On the other hand, our spirit is *our* power of thinking, of desiring and seeking, of being interested, of purposing and doing. When the Spirit of God speaks to us, He speaks in our spirits, that is to say, in our thoughts, in our affections, in our wills. When we make God's thoughts our thoughts, love Him as He loves us, surrender our wills to accomplish His will, then we have the new heart, we are born again. This new birth, this begetting us anew, is not something God does *to* us, but something He does *through* us—something He does by means of our own thinking and desiring and purposing and striving. He appeals to us in our human nature, He persuades us by revealing Himself, He wins us by His love for us—and all through Jesus Christ. It is Christ who saves us, not we who save ourselves. The preacher's duty and the teacher's is first and foremost to bring men into the presence of Christ, and to let Christ do His own special and gracious work of saving. It is not any word of ours that delivers men, but Christ; it is not any argument of ours that persuades men, but the Spirit of Christ, breathing like the wind upon the spirit of man. It is a mystery. Yet there is no mystery in this plain fact, that we can leave off our own petty efforts at salvation and our own narrow thoughts of God's mercy, and get out into the light of Christ, and breathe the fresh air of His redeeming love.

A friend of mine was called out one morning to visit a dying child. He had a mile or two to walk in the sunshine and the bracing air of a fine summer day. When he entered the ploughman's cottage, he found the tiny closet crowded with sympathetic neighbours, and the sobbing mother bending low over the dying infant. He felt stifled with the close air, and in his usual rapid manner, took in the situation and acted at once. Asking the women to withdraw and leave the kitchen door open, he lifted the mother from her child, saying: 'Stand back, you are choking your child.' He tried to open the little window, but finding it fixed, broke the glass with his stick. 'Stand back,' he quietly repeated to the mother, 'and let your child breathe the fresh air.' It very quickly revived. The child was actually choking for want of air, and

there were cubic miles of life-giving air on every side around it. This is a figure of what is happening in the spiritual world every day and in every Christian land. The great tide of the Father's universal, unwearying, inexhaustible love is beating upon us and surging around us every moment of our lives, and we shut our children up in the close stifling air of our own petty thoughts of Him, debate over little details of doctrine and church order, unchurch one another for not holding views which our Lord never mentioned. Thus our children have their spiritual instincts and aspirations checked and perverted within them. Stand back and let the love of their Heavenly Father flow freely into their hearts. Let them look into the face of Jesus Christ, and it will transform them into His image. Let them feel something of His compassion, and see what agonies He bore for their sakes. It is the presence of Christ, and the contemplation of His words and His sufferings, that create the new heart, and bring a man, even when he is old, to birth again.

There is another thought, one which may have been in your minds while I have been speaking. If it is in any sense a birth, you may say, how is it possible, now that our habits of thought and feeling have been formed? Let me conclude with a few words on this mysterious problem. There is,

I believe, in every man a germ of the divine, which, if it is cared for, fed and nourished, will change him into a son of God. This germ of spiritual life is often buried deep under habits of sin, or under the cares and worries of business, or the inordinate love of knowledge, or the calls of social life, or the satisfactions of a happy home. Into such entanglements, the whole life may get so absorbed that there is no time left for God. Nevertheless the seed remains, and cannot entirely be destroyed so long as man is man, for it is a part of his rational nature. The grace of the Almighty has not been sleeping, for appeals have been made to this germ from day to day in books, and speech, in the lives of men and women, in the events that have been a man's lot, in sorrow or defeat or failure, in the coming of his children, or the approach of death. These have kept the life from perishing. Then at last on God's own day, Christ comes athwart the soul; He speaks, and the soul listens; He pleads, and the soul feels the power of the pleading; He persuades, and the soul yields itself; He reveals the love of the Father in the Cross, and the soul embraces Him. Then is seen what is surely the most marvellous of all miracles, the bands of sin and self are broken, and the man rises clean away from the thraldom of his old life, and becomes the bondslave of Christ for ever.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord.'—Ro 12<sup>11</sup>.

A LIFE spent on a farm that is not too big can be very happy indeed, especially to boys and girls. I am thinking of a boy called George Williams who had his home at a delightful English farmstead. Such a jolly place it was. You would have loved the great open fireplace in the kitchen; both a pot and a kettle could hang over the fire at the same time, and there was room for a person to sit on a stool inside the fireplace. Then there was an old oak settle standing against the wall. If you sat on it and looked up you could see that the rafters were almost quite black, and you would feel that you did not wish them to be any other colour. The smoke from the fire painted them.

George was quite young—just fifteen—when he left that dear home to go to a town called Bridgewater to learn the drapery business. That was in the year 1836, so he must have been born in 1821.

It was a misty summer morning when he and his father set out for Bridgewater. Even although it was very early you may be sure his mother came down to the gate at the end of the garden which opened on to the public road and bade her boy an affectionate good-bye, and then stood watching the two figures in the dogcart until they were quite out of sight.

George was a ruddy-faced, active boy. Standing behind the shop counter he seemed born to the business. He loved it. He did more than merely sell things; he kept writing down, or committing to memory, particulars of prices and names of

stomers. His pockets were always stuffed with pers.

His master knew that he had a good apprentice, and he was a favourite with the other lads. But you may be sure George's thoughts often turned to the farm, and the dear mother who lived there.

There were twenty-seven assistants in the Bridgewater shop, and they all lived in, that is to say, there were rooms provided for them on the premises. They were supposed to go to the Congregational Church, but only George and one or two others went. He heard a message there which he never forgot. 'I first learned in Bridgewater to love my dear Lord and Saviour for what he had done for me,' he said long afterwards.

After some years he left Bridgewater to go to London. There he joined a church where he could get plenty of church work to do. There was a wonderful preacher in it, one who would not let anybody go to sleep. George loved to listen to him, and he set himself to try to get other young men to attend. He felt sure that hearing such preaching would give them something good to think about during the week and lead them on to be better men.

Every day but Sunday he was busy in the warehouse of a firm of wholesale and retail drapers, and from the time he went into it he climbed the ladder of success. His upward progress was made step by step. One of the buyers was seen cutting off a piece of silk and putting it into a drawer. His master found this out and dismissed him. George Williams got his place. But he did not become conceited; he pegged away, working in the interest of his master day after day and month after month, until through that little country lad's exertions the business became ever so much bigger.

There were a hundred and forty hands in the warehouse instead of twenty-seven as at Bridgewater. They too were boarded in the house. George Williams felt sorry for them. He knew that many of the lads were fresh from country homes like himself—homes where God was feared—and now they were drifting into the habit of never entering a church door. They spent their Sundays in a way that not only would have grieved their mothers, but was doing great harm to their own souls. George started a prayer-meeting. It met in a little upper room. At first only three came, but gradually the attendance increased

until the little room was packed full of young men, all deeply in earnest. It must have been a wonderful sight.

That prayer-meeting was the beginning of the Young Men's Christian Association. Through George Williams' influence other business houses began to have their prayer-meetings; then an association was formed and given a name. During the war the name of the Y.M.C.A. was on every one's lips. Boys wrote home, telling what a blessing it was to them. They felt they had a sort of home in the huts, and at the meetings they sometimes got fitted with armour, and when they put it on they knew there was no need to fear even death.

To tell what George Williams did for the Y.M.C.A. would make a long story in itself. You are more concerned to know about the boy who left the farm one misty summer morning, without influence, without money, and became a great business man. He succeeded because he deserved success. He worked hard, and he loved his work. One thing he said in referring to his own success was that he believed that religious men who had natural ability, education, and a certain amount of general knowledge made the best men of business.

When the Y.M.C.A. had been in existence fifty years, there were Jubilee Celebrations, and at the same time George Williams was made a knight. When he read the letter telling him of Queen Victoria's pleasure, 'It is not for me,' he said, 'it is for the Association. It belongs to our Master; let us put it at His feet.' There and then he and his friends knelt in prayer, and humbly gave the glory to Him to whom it was due.

Boys and girls generally pity old people. 'Poor old man,' 'Poor old woman,' they say. They don't know how beautiful old age may be to those who watch it with understanding eyes. With Sir George Williams it was as if the glory of the old world overlapped into this. He loved children. When he was eighty-one, and visiting the seaside at Filey, he stood on the top of a sand-castle and addressed a crowd of little ones gathered round him. There was a photograph taken of that meeting, and it shows a little girl being lifted up to shake hands with him and doubtless to get his blessing. You would have liked to be in her place, would you not?

At the end, 'He did but dream of Heaven and he was there.' He was buried in St. Paul's

Cathedral, near which he had so long been in business. He had lived for the people, and in death the people claimed him.

#### The Shadow of a Cloud.

'The shadow of a cloud.'—Is 25<sup>5</sup>.

You all know what a shadow is. It is the outline of a figure or form thrown on the ground or on some object. A shadow is made when something gets in the way of the light. When a cloud comes between us and the sun its shadow is thrown on the earth. When you get between a lamp and a wall your shadow is thrown on the wall. So you see that to form a shadow there must be two things—light and something that obscures or cuts off part of the light.

Now shadows are things that we are not very fond of as a rule. When the sun hides his face behind a cloud we feel dull and cold till he peeps out again. And so people have often compared troubles to shadows. It is of this kind of shadow I want to speak to-day.

There are two sorts of trouble shadows in the world. There are the shadows God sends, and there are the shadows we make.

i. First let us look at the shadows God sends. What are the names of some of them? Difficulties, disappointments, sorrows. Sometimes you hear people talking as if boys and girls had no troubles at all, as if their days were one long blaze of sunshine from morning to night. But I don't think that is the case. Boys and girls are perhaps able to forget their troubles sooner than the grown-ups, but I think that while the troubles are there, they are just as big to the boys and girls as the older people's troubles are to them, and just as hard to bear.

A great many people are puzzled to know why God sends us these shadows. 'If God loves us so much,' they say, 'why does He send us things that hurt us?' And they forget that it is just because God loves us so much that He does send us troubles. Some things grow best in the dark. If you want to grow a hyacinth in a pot, after you have planted it you must shut it up for some weeks in a dark cupboard. And God knows that some beautiful things would never grow in our lives if the clouds did not hide the sun. If we lived always in the sunshine we might become lazy and selfish, or proud and hard. But God sends the

shadows to make us brave and strong, sympathetic and kind.

The big question for you and for me is—how are we to deal with those shadows that God sends? Some people fret and rebel against them; others persist in looking at nothing but the shadows, and so they get into deeper and deeper gloom. Both those ways are foolish. When we are in the shadow we must remember to make use of the shade to grow the beautiful things that won't flourish in the sunshine. And we must keep remembering that there can never be a shadow without light, and that somewhere on the other side of the shadow is sunshine. There is a verse which says:

The inner side of every cloud  
Is bright and shining;  
I therefore turn my clouds about  
And wear them always inside out  
To show the lining.

On the other side of the cloud that looks so dark the sun is shining. Don't forget the bright side of the cloud.

2. But what of the shadows we make? Well, you know everybody carries a shadow about with them. They can't help it. Wherever you go, your shadow goes too. And so I think that wherever we go we shall always find little troubles and annoyances.

But there are two things we can do with these shadows.

First we can see that they are not exaggerated. You know that when the sun is low or we are a long way off from a street lamp our shadows grow to an extraordinary size—quite out of proportion to ourselves. Our legs look yards long and our body is drawn out like a telescope.

There is a mountain in Germany called the Brocken. It is nearly a mile high, and at sunset a great wall of mist hangs over it. If you went up there towards sunset and stood at a certain spot on the top you might see what looked like the shadow of a huge giant thrown on the clouds. And then you would notice that when you moved the giant moved, and you would discover that the likeness of the giant was nothing but your own shadow very much exaggerated. So don't exaggerate your small worries. Don't make them ten times bigger than they are. That is the first way to deal with the shadows we carry about.

And the second way is—keep your face towards the sun. If you do that, do you know what will happen? Your shadow will be behind you, and that is where it ought to be. Don't keep walking in your own shadow, and looking at your own shadow. Don't brood over your troubles. How can you help feeling sad and gloomy if you do?

The sun's in a cloud,  
The morning is dreary,  
The way is too long,  
The feet are too weary,  
The friend is not kind,  
And smiles are not shining,  
The roses and robins  
Are paling and pining.  
That hour is the saddest  
From May day to Yule  
When little Dolores  
Is going to school.

What is the reason? She turns from the light,  
And walks in her shadow from morning till night.

The sun is the brightest,  
The morn is the clearest,  
The burden is lightest,  
The friend is the dearest,  
The flowers are all waking,  
The way is not long;  
The birds are all breaking  
At once into song.  
That hour is the gladdest  
From May day to Yule,  
When little Allegra  
Is going to school.

What is the secret? Wherever you find her,  
The shadow of little Allegra's behind her.<sup>1</sup>

There is just one thing more I should like you to remember. Don't make shadows for other people. Never stand in anybody else's light and shut off the sunshine from them. I have known people who were like cold, damp shadows whenever they entered a house, and all because their tempers were black and horrid. Don't be shadows to other people; don't make the world darker or colder for anybody. Aim rather at being sunbeams, and then you will cheer and bless wherever you go.

### Three Great Trees.

'A great tree.'—Lk 13<sup>10</sup> (A.V.).

'A great tree.'—That is our text this morning. I am just sorry it is not '*three* great trees,' for I

<sup>1</sup> M. A. Lathbury.

am going to tell you this morning of three great trees, each of which is great in more ways than one.

The trees of which I am going to speak are alive at this moment, so far as I know. They are all to be found in the north-east corner of Scotland, and they are growing not so very far apart. You could see them all in one day if you had a cycle, for the first and the second are growing within a mile or two of each other, and the third is distant only about thirty miles from the first.

1. The first great tree grows at the edge of a wood close to the road. You can hardly fail to notice it as you walk past. If your eyes are sharp you will look twice at it, and then you will exclaim, 'How very queer!' No wonder! This extraordinary tree is not one tree, but two trees in one. About a foot from the ground the trunk, which is that of a beech, divides in two. One-half goes on growing as a beech, but the other turns into an ash. You can pick out its stem at once in contrast with that of the beech, and if you look up you will see far overhead branches of ash leaves and branches of beech leaves mingling in the friendliest fashion. How did these trees come to be one? Who can tell? They are old trees now, and they have been sharing the same roots for many and many a year. There is no quarrelling who shall have the most sap, or who shall get the greatest amount of sunshine. They have shared and shared alike all their lives, and that is why people stop to admire them to-day.

I wish we were all as ready as that tree to share our good things. I am afraid some of us are more like the little girl who had a sister a year older than herself. Whatever the older sister got the younger insisted on having also. Her favourite words were, 'Me too!' One day the older girl was ill and the doctor ordered her medicine with a particularly horrid taste. Little sister saw the bottle, and she saw mother measuring out a spoonful into a glass for the invalid. As usual she cried, 'Me too!' And mother thought it would be a good lesson for little sister, and she knew the medicine would do her no harm, so she gave 'Me too' an overflowing spoonful. After that 'Me too' was less heard in the nursery.

Now which do you admire most—the twin trees or little 'Me too'? I know which I admire, and which I wish you to copy.

2. The second tree is a lime tree. It is growing in the grounds of a famous castle, and it is almost as famous as the castle itself. It is carefully preserved and has a railing round it, and the Duke who owns it is tremendously proud of it. Well he may be! How big do you think it is? Well, you may not believe me when I tell you, but it covers half an acre of ground. It is so huge that they say 1000 men can stand under its shade. How did it manage to grow so great? I can tell you in three words—by being humble. When it spread its long branches it did not lift them haughtily to heaven, it bent them meekly towards the earth. And these branches as they swept the ground took root and sprang up again around their parent tree, so that besides the great main stem there are countless smaller stems steadyng and supporting and feeding that great tree. Like all truly great people that splendid lime is humble. You see, you never can be truly great unless you are first truly humble.

They tell a tale of a certain royal princess who is living to-day. When she was a young girl she was crossing a gangway from a ship to the quay, and her foot slipped. She would have fallen but a sailor on the ship put out a hand and steadied her saying, 'Take care, Miss!' The princess, I suppose, was rather cross about having tripped, and she turned round and said sharply, 'Don't call me "Miss"! Remember I am a *Princess*.' The sailor looked rather abashed, but the Queen, who was walking behind her daughter, had heard the rebuke. She turned to the sailor and said graciously, 'Thank you very much indeed for your kindness. My daughter, as she says, is a princess; but we hope some day she will be a *lady*.' That wise Queen knew that to be proud was to be merely small, and to be humble was to be really great. Boys and girls, which do you admire most—the giant tree or the silly princess?

3. The third tree is an oak. To my mind it is the greatest of the three great trees, although you may not agree with me at the first glance. It grows, like the first tree, near the highroad. But, alas! it does not stand up straight and tall. A winter's gale has blown it over, and it lies on its side with three-quarters of its roots sticking up in the air. Its leafy top too has been sawn away, for it fell across the road, and so it has only about twenty feet of trunk left. Do you think it has given

up and ceased to grow because it has lost all its head and most of its roots? Not a bit of it! It is as busy as ever sending out branches and leaves on the piece of trunk which remains.

And so I think that tree is the greatest of the three trees because it is so brave and plucky. You would have quite excused it if, when the wind knocked it over and the saw beheaded it, it had said, 'It's no use growing any more. I'm done. All I can do now is to die.' But that oak was no ordinary oak. It had plenty pluck, and with its six remaining roots it set to work to make itself over again.

Boys and girls, I want you to imitate that oak. Never acknowledge you are beaten. Stick in! What are difficulties and obstacles? They are just chances to show your mettle. Keep smiling, and keep going on when it would be easier to sit down and weep. Though you should lose everything else in the world, *never lose heart*. That's pluck. And it is pluck that wins in life. You admire it, I admire it, every one admires it. And, let me tell you a secret, God admires it most of all.

### The Christian Year.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

**Christianity is Christ.**

'To me to live is Christ.'—Ph 1<sup>21</sup>.

The distinctive fact in Christianity is Christ. Three points deserve prominence.

i. The personality of Jesus Christ belongs to history, not myth. When we ask the precise reason why Christianity prevailed as a world-religion, whereas the hero-cults of antiquity have so utterly perished that to-day they have no votaries at all, the answer to a great extent lies in the circumstance that Dionysus, Herakles, Attis, and the like were purely legendary figures impossible to localize in any situation known to have been historically real, but Jesus Christ lived and died. His rivals failed to appear within the lists of time. No witnesses came forward testifying that they had associated with Serapis or Isis in life's common ways, had listened to their words, or made acquaintance with their character and found that their life answered consistently to their doctrine. Jesus, on the contrary, was presented in the personal testimony of those who had known

Him. 'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.' Built thus on the actual, His Gospel could outlast the storms of speculation. The soil of fact, to which its roots went down, afforded stability and growth and ever-renewed vigour.

It has occasionally been complained that the Jesus of the Apostles' Creed might, except for a trifling historical reference like the mention of Pontius Pilate, be quite well identified or at least co-ordinated with any of the contemporary nature-deities, say the Babylonian Tammuz. But even in the Apostles' Creed, in spite of its not over-successful attempts to identify Jesus in a fashion satisfactory to the Christian mind, the strongest emphasis is laid on history; and in the New Testament, especially the Gospels, the first interest of every writer is beyond dispute in facts. A deep gulf therefore separates Jesus from mythic sun-gods or deities of vegetation, whose alleged experiences are but imaginative transcripts of natural processes interpreted as the fortunes or adventures of gods and goddesses who, like leaves or grass, die in winter to revive again in spring. This is to say nothing of the rude, foul, or unintelligible elements which these mythic stories may contain.

2. The History of Religions contains no parallel to the self-consciousness of Jesus. Unless we toss the Gospels overboard, it is certain that our Lord's attitude to God, to men, and to His own significance for the world is an unprecedented attitude. What we know of Buddha or Mohammed, to take the chief examples, shows nothing in the least analogous to His sense of Divine sonship, His experience of God's love, His perfect fulfilment of vocation. Unquestionably Jesus seems to conceive of salvation as dependent on Himself; He seems to call men less to His teaching than to His own person as the embodiment and guarantee of the truth He proclaims; He seems implicitly to take God's place in relation to the soul, and to make personal devoted love to Him the equivalent of faith in the redemptive sense of the word. He seems to do all these things, and there is no reason to doubt that actually He did them.

But nothing in the least resembling this is characteristic of the method pursued by the great religious teachers. No other religious leader can be named who displays a tendency to identify with himself the truth proclaimed by him, or to claim that in him revelation is so focused and concen-

trated as to be charged with power to save. In the case of Jesus, however, His conscious sonship is felt by Him to be the supreme reality; and in the light of it He recognized clearly the work God had laid upon Him. It was not that He knew Himself as Messiah, and from this rose to the certainty that God was His Father; the connexion of the two facts is just the opposite. He is Son of Man, visible Head of the Kingdom of God, in virtue of the still deeper consciousness that He is Son of God. The roots of His vocation lie in the uniqueness of His relation to the Father. But eventually we cannot separate these two aspects. The higher in the scale of being a human character may stand, the more completely vocation and personality coincide, and in the case of Jesus the coincidence was absolute. 'It is, in fact, the *differentia* of Christianity as a religion,' writes Denney, 'that the distinction which can sometimes be drawn between a person and the cause for which he stands is in it no longer valid.'

3. In Christ there is given the personal presence of God, in redeeming power. The term 'incarnation,' which to certain minds has recently become suspect, will no doubt recover its place in due course, since it represents an idea with which the religious mind, at its highest, cannot dispense. We may use it here without concern to indicate the fact that in Jesus Christ, who lived a man's life, we confront the redemptive agency of God in a degree that transcends all we could ask or think. Nor is incarnation only a metaphor. As Canon Streeter has observed, 'if the essential, distinctive, and most fundamental quality of the Spirit we call God is love, this is a quality which can be exhibited directly and undisguisedly and without any admixture of symbolism and metaphor in a perfect human life and character.' Christian faith is built upon the conviction that in Jesus' life, death, and triumph the pathway between the Father and His human children has been opened up, and opened from God's side. We claim for the Gospel, as a vital and unique element, this perfectly moralized thought of mediation through incarnate love. Jesus meets a world of sin not as the supreme prophet merely, but as One fully aware that in the relationship of God and man everything turns upon Himself.

Incarnation doubtless is an idea as old, or very nearly as old, as religion itself. That gods, moved by desires selfish or beneficent, could temporarily assume human form, was

widely believed. In Scandinavian, Greek, and Indian mythology this thought frequently recurs; but it really affords no analogy to the Christian message, if for no other reason than for this, that the presupposed idea of God is so imperfectly ethical that Deity can with equal facility unite itself to either human or animal nature. In Hinduism, for example, the thought of incarnation is specially associated with the god Vishnu, who during the series of his numerous *avatars* may assume the guise of fish or tortoise. If it be replied that he is completely manifested in Krishna, constituting in this form a full satisfaction and epitome of the cravings and experiences of the Hindu soul, we must yet consider that all this stands in no positive relation to historic fact. What the mythology does bear witness to is the need of a personal Redeemer operating within human life, and through it revealing God; precisely this actuality is lacking. Krishna, as a self, is no part of the historical record, and in the vague fantastic outlines of the picture it is impossible for us to envisage any authentic character, deeply based in credible experience. To gain the world, the truth of God as He is must embody itself in a tale of morally verifiable meaning, with for hero a self-accrediting personality.<sup>1</sup>

#### ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Atonement.

'Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.'—I P 2<sup>24</sup>.

When we read the Scripture aright, we see that atonement has its spring and energy within the Divine, holy Love itself. When, accordingly, that Love loads itself with the sin of man, and carries it in unknown anguish, atonement has been made, salvation has been won, God has reconciled the world to Himself. The whole meaning of the atonement, and all its issues and consequences, are far beyond the experience even of the ripest faith, or of the whole community of the redeemed. God alone can comprehend in its fulness what God alone has wrought. Nevertheless, enlightened by the experience of salvation, through that atoning deed, we may grasp certain aspects of its wonder and its truth.

(1) In the first place, if God bear the sin of men, then the nature of sin has been exposed with a completeness which no doctrinal statement could attain. It is an offence against the infinite Love. What sinners assail is not impersonal Law, but the living God Himself. The blow is struck at His heart, and it gets home.

(2) In the second place, if God bear the sin of men, the judgment, which is sin's inevitable conse-

quence, has been laid upon His heart and has been lifted away for ever. The guilt of sin committed, as it is, against the living and holy God, cannot be borne by the sinner himself. Not the sinner's utmost woe, not even the punishment of all the guilty souls that ever were, could be the equivalent of that judgment which sin deserves, and must receive, if the moral universe is to remain unshaken in the estimate of a holy God, and in that of an enlightened human conscience. Love, no less than Holiness, requires that sin shall be judged if men are to be redeemed. Love alone can bear that judgment which itself demands. When Love carries in its heart the guilt and shame of the world, sin is judged, and the holiness of God is vindicated.

(3) In the third place, if God bear the sin of men, sacrificial Love has been proved victorious. In the world where man's self-assertion and selfishness sought and claimed the victory, they have been defeated, once for all. Love has triumphed in the very act in which it laid upon itself the need of men, and bore it through nameless experience of Divine sorrow. In the centre of the moral universe, enthroned above all cosmic powers and principles, is seated vicarious suffering Love.

To begin to discern these things, to apprehend, even in some measure, our need as sinners, sin's exceeding sinfulness, the awfulness of its judgment, and the deathless energy of sacrificial Love, is the beginning of our salvation. To enter ever more deeply into them, to repent with growing grief and hatred of sin, to cast ourselves in our guilt and helplessness more and more upon the everlasting mercy, to open our very souls to the constraint of dying Love, and to live ever more simply and fully as its subjects, its witnesses and its vehicles—this is to become, in ever-enlarging measure, partakers of the great salvation.<sup>2</sup>

#### TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Living Christ in Ephesians.

'The Lord Jesus Christ.'—Eph 1<sup>1</sup>.

It is with Jesus as the Christ that St. Paul deals in this Epistle, rather than with Jesus as the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. That St. Paul's language about the Christ presupposes His Divinity may be entirely true. As has been often pointed

<sup>1</sup> H. R. Mackintosh, *The Originality of the Christian Message*.

<sup>2</sup> T. B. Kilpatrick, *The Redemption of Man*.

but, such language as that of the opening sentence—‘Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ’—seems itself to presuppose it. If the Messiahship of Jesus is sufficient to account for such language, Messiahship must involve far more than the Hebrews were accustomed to believe. Moreover, St. Paul certainly believed that our Lord was One who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, and that He was in the form of God before He took upon Himself the form of a servant. But the full and formulated doctrine of the Person of Christ belongs to a time far later than St. Paul’s, and we should not anticipate it in interpreting his words.

What is it then that, as Christ, Jesus has done and does for us? We will begin with the facts of His earthly life.

1. Now it is not St. Paul’s way to dwell in detail upon the facts of our Lord’s earthly life. It was the Lord living and glorified who had revealed Himself to St. Paul, and with whom St. Paul was chiefly concerned. There is perhaps no Epistle of which this is more true than it is of the Epistle to the Ephesians. But we may easily exaggerate St. Paul’s want of interest in our Lord’s earthly life; there are instances even in this Epistle where the thought of our Lord’s earthly life may lie behind his words, and they are of some interest.

Look first at the passage of the Epistle where St. Paul first turns directly to the position of the Gentiles (<sup>217-22</sup>). Note first the words in which he says that our Lord came and preached peace to those that were far off and peace to those that were nigh. Is it quite clear that, as Dr. Robinson urges, in these words, ‘We have a reference, not to the work of the Lord Jesus on earth before the crucifixion, but to the work of the exalted Christ in announcing the peace which His death had made’? No doubt it may be so: though the language in this case seems somewhat strange, the strangeness may be explained by the fact that St. Paul is adopting Old Testament words; and the preaching of the Apostles in the power of the Spirit of Christ may be rightly described as the coming and the preaching of the Lord Himself. But the action of the Lord certainly forms one great whole. The Gospels, as St. Luke says, tell us what ‘Jesus began both to do and to teach’ (Ac 1<sup>1</sup>), and the Acts what He further did after His Ascension; and St. Paul’s language may cover both parts of His activity.

St. Paul was surely aware that the Lord in His earthly life did preach peace to those who were afar off as well as those that were nigh. In the first place, He appealed to the outcasts, who, like the Gentiles, were alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and whose spiritual position He practically identified with that of the heathen (Mt 18<sup>17</sup>). In the second place, notably in His sermon at Nazareth, our Lord clearly seems to anticipate the inclusion of the Gentiles within the body to which the blessings of the kingdom belong, provided that they exercise that faith which the people of Nazareth are refusing. Both the widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian are examples of people who receive supernatural blessing through their faith in the promises of God made by His servants. In the teaching of the Lord, as in the teaching of St. Paul himself, it is faith, and not obedience to the words of the law, which enables men to receive the blessings of the kingdom.

2. Secondly, we should observe the words in which St. Paul says that the Gentiles are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone. We are, of course, at once reminded of the Lord’s own words as to the foundation upon which He will build His Church, and of His reference to Himself as the corner-stone. This reference follows immediately upon the parable of the wicked husbandmen, who murdered the son and heir of the Lord of the vineyard, the parable which concludes with the words, ‘What therefore will the Lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen and will give the vineyard unto others.’ We see again how close is the connexion between St. Paul’s teaching and that of the Lord. St. Paul’s doctrine of the universal headship intended for Christ is one with our Lord’s teaching that He is the ‘Heir.’ Moreover, the very reason why the Church must be rebuilt is that it is faith in Jesus as the Christ which is the essential thing, and not obedience to the Mosaic Law; and from this it follows that Gentiles may be members of the Church as well as Jews.

3. Thirdly, we should observe the words in which St. Paul says that ‘our Lord made Gentiles and Jews to be one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained

in ordinances' (2<sup>14, 15</sup>). We need not at this point consider the rather difficult thoughts as to the relation of Christ's death to the law, which appear in other Epistles, and may here also be in St. Paul's mind. Two things at any rate are clear. In the first place, the separation of Jews from Gentiles did centre round the law. Though the Church was open to all even before the Lord came, the necessity for those who would join it of obedience to the law formed for the vast majority of Gentiles an obstacle practically insuperable. In the second place, it was our Lord who took this barrier away. Not only did His teaching 'make all meats clean' (Mk 7<sup>19</sup>); its whole trend, like that of the prophetic teaching, was to discount the importance of all that was not really included in the dictates of holiness and love. Finally, by opening a new way to the Father, He rendered the old means of approach no longer necessary. As St. Paul says, He reconciled them both in one body unto God through the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby. At the Conference of Jerusalem it was precisely this consideration of the new way made to the Father, to which St. Peter referred as rendering it no longer reasonable to insist upon the observance of the law. 'God,' he says, 'made no distinction between Gentiles and Jews,' cleansing their hearts by faith. 'Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they.' Those are the abiding refutations of legalism, ready for it whenever it lifts its head. Let the legalist say what he will about the obligatory character of the things upon which he lays such stress, God, in the bestowal of His spiritual blessings, makes no distinction between those who observe them and those who do not. Moreover, the legalist himself does not really trust them. He looks to be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, as others do.<sup>1</sup>

#### THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Fulness of Life.

'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.'—Jn 10<sup>10</sup>.

When the Son of God took our human nature

<sup>1</sup> H. L. Goudge, *Three Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians*.

upon Him, He entered into the whole of our human life, and made all human experience His own—except sin, which is not truly human. He came that men might have life, and might have it abundantly; and while His chief purpose was to restore that highest form of life which is fellowship with God, He cared intensely for the soundness and sacredness of those human relationships which are an essential part of the life of men. His victory was won in the spiritual sphere, but that victory embraces body, soul, and spirit, and the things which men call secular share in its fruits. Therefore the whole Church was a great brotherhood, and its sacraments told of fellowship among men, as well as of fellowship between man and God. The old barriers were broken down, for all humanity is summed up in Jesus Christ. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. Ye are all one man in Christ Jesus.' Race, class, sex do not count: Christ is all and in all.

How, then, can we set about our duty, and what steps can we take to follow the example of the Church in its best days?

1. We must claim for the Christian law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. Truism as this seems to us, there is an immense number of Christian people who either disregard the claim or offer mere lip service to it. Our first business is to convert the Church to a true idea of what conversion means. It is perfectly true that conversion is the primary work of the Church; but even now it is commonly supposed that conversion begins and ends with the interests of a man's own soul, and that the goal to which a man is turned is an enlightened self-interest—viz. his soul's eternal welfare. The point to be made clear is that Christian conversion means a turning from self to Christ: it is the acceptance of our Lord as the Saviour who saves us from selfishness, and as the King who demands our whole-hearted allegiance. If He is to be King anywhere, He must be King everywhere. We cannot possibly exclude our politics, our social relationships, or our industry, from His sovereignty. We must at least try to apply His principles at every point.

2. We must therefore make up our minds what are the Christian principles which rule social practice. On most of those principles we are agreed. A brief statement of them may be found in the report of the Committee on 'Christianity

and Industry appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

(1) The Gospels draw a clear distinction between life and the means of living. Avarice, the inordinate desire for gain, is regarded as a sin not less grave than some others which are to-day more generally condemned. There is an austere and reiterated warning against undue preoccupation with what we should call 'economic considerations.' Wealth is a responsibility for its owners, not a luxury to be used as they please.

(2) Every human personality is of infinite and equal value, because all are children of the one Father. Therefore it is wrong to use any human being for less than a human purpose. So far as an industrial system treats men or women as mere instruments of production, that system stands condemned.

(3) This emphasis on the value of individuality is balanced by the emphasis on the fact that Christians are members of a society. As we are brethren, the principle of working together for the common good is clearly more Christian than the principle of competing one against another for private profit. According to the doctrine of the New Testament, work is a duty laid upon all; the members of a Christian community should aim at giving rather than getting, and they should seek the service of others rather than the personal profit of themselves. 'The doctrine sometimes advanced that a man is free to do what he likes with his own, that all men are justified in following their own pecuniary interests to the fullest extent allowed by law, and that social well-being will incidentally but certainly result from their efforts to further their own self-interest, is definitely anti-Christian.'

(4) The New Testament emphasizes the duty of the society to its members. 'The social order must be tested by the degree in which it secures for each freedom for happy, useful, and untrammelled life, and distributes, as widely and equitably as may be, social advantages and opportunities.' Quite clearly there are problems with regard to infant life, to housing, to the payment of an adequate wage, to unemployment, etc., the responsibility for which lies upon the whole community, and no member of the community can absolve himself from the duty of at least helping to solve them.

3. Even with regard to these principles, about which all Christian people must surely be agreed,

the Church needs to give a better witness than it has given in the past. If it were alive to its duty 'it would point out to its members that if they are living idly, whether on charity or on inherited wealth, when they are able to work, they are committing a sin; that luxury and waste in any class of society are not only correspondent to, but largely responsible for, the want and destitution which are a blot on that society, and that this connection of cause and effect needs to be clearly indicated to those concerned. When it saw men making large fortunes out of public necessities it would remonstrate with them. When it saw one class taking advantage of another and more helpless class, it would point out that this was wrong. Nor would the Church confine itself to warnings of a negative character. It would emphasize the duty of strenuous and honest work, the obligation of all men to observe a high standard of honour, of public spirit, and of humanity in their economic transactions, and their moral responsibility for the organisation of industry and for the standard of social life obtaining in the society of which they are members. Above all, it would seek to impress upon them the conviction that industry is a social function carried on for the benefit of the whole community, and would teach them to seek satisfaction, not in evading their share of the common task, but in discharging it more faithfully.'<sup>1</sup>

#### FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Courage!

'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.'—Mt 9<sup>2</sup>.

Three times the phrase 'Be of good cheer' is used in the Gospels by Jesus. The literal translation would be 'Courage.' It is the call from despair to hope. It is the incentive to heroism. It is the inspiration to a new awakening.

You will find the passages in Mt 9<sup>2</sup>, 'Courage, my son; your sins are forgiven you'; Mt 14<sup>29</sup>, 'Courage; it is I, have no fear'; and Jn 16<sup>33</sup>, 'Courage, I have conquered the world.' They are thus spoken to the sinner, to the frightened and wearied, and to the afflicted and persecuted worker. It is the gospel of good cheer as preached by the Founder of the Christian faith.

The classical use of the term in Aristotle and

<sup>1</sup> J. A. Kempthorne, in *Some Christian Essentials of Reconstruction*.

Plutarch means 'Collect yourself; have your wits about you; be ready for action.' That is a warning. Christ's use of the term was an inspiration. The inspiration includes the warning. I would rather have the inspiration with the warning than the warning without the inspiration. That is why Jesus is better than Aristotle. Jesus always inspires, because He is the only teacher in the world who is able to look into the future with hopefulness. And without hope the world falls into a dismal despondency.

1. Christ's first use of the word was to an individual. 'Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.' But for sin the earth would be like heaven. Every age has had its saviour and its panacea. In every case except one the saviour and the panacea have been spelt with a small letter. There has only been one Saviour. Another will never be needed. Christ is the only One who has been able effectively to say—and He waits to say it to you—'Thy sins be forgiven thee.'

Be of good cheer, then, my brother, it is possible for you to rise above your weakness, your passion, your sins. Christ can impart unto you the power to rise above your circumstances, to master yourself, and to transform your troubles into blessings, and to be glad. That is why the Gospel is called 'Glad tidings.' Christ's message to every individual is of forgiveness.

2. The second use of the term is to a select company of men—the disciples, troubled, tired, frightened, as they were pulling their small craft across the boisterous lake in the midnight darkness. But 'He saw them toiling in rowing.' He knew every stroke of the oars, saw every swelling of their muscles, beheld every sweat-drop fall from their perspiring heads. He saw and heeded, though they thought He did not. At the moment when they were about to give up in despair He called out to them, as He also appeared by their side, 'Courage; it is I, be not afraid.'

And there is the promise of the perpetual companionship of the Saviour with those who are

doing His will; for those men were in the path of duty; it was for Him they were rowing; they could have turned about and gone with the wind homeward; but they toiled on, and in toiling they 'had the vision splendid.'

Beware, however, of the kind of courage which Peter exhibited when he attempted to walk on the water and sank. Courage is fearlessness and fearlessness with consecrated intelligence is faith. The faith which the presence of Christ always brings is that which 'laughs at impossibilities, and cries it shall be done.'

3. The third use of the term was to a company which represented the human race. 'Courage; I have conquered the world.' That was a daring assertion to make. It was either blasphemy or audacious faith. We know now that it was the audacity of faith. The audacity is seen in that it was made on the very eve of His crucifixion, which in the eyes of the world was the indication of His failure. But with the full knowledge of what Calvary meant He actually in sight of it declared the ultimate success of His mission as if it were an actual realized fact. 'I have overcome.' 'I have conquered the world.' The purpose of it was that as they would be exposed to trials after His departure they should ever remember His exhortation to steadfastness and ever believe in the sure success of their cause.

There you are, then, brothers—dare to be, do, suffer, die, if needs be, but never lose your faith. Meet your trials with gladness, and your tribulation with cheerfulness, and you, too, will be a conqueror who will put Alexander and Caesar and Napoleon to shame. You have already put the Kaiser to shame. 'This is the victory which overcometh the world, even your faith.'

Now, as conquerors wear the jubilant garb, carry the cheerful countenance, show the exultant spirit, and shame the world's levity. So, by the sacred fulness of your joy, 'Be of good cheer, courage.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fred A. Rees, *Honour and Heroism*.

# Our Lord's Cry on the Cross.

(MARK xv. 34 AND MATT. xxvii. 46.)

BY WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D., WOODBROOKE, BIRMINGHAM,  
AND THE REVEREND J. A. SMALLBONE, SOUTHPORT.

WHY was there wrung from Jesus Christ on the Cross a cry of desolation? Theologians used to answer, because He was facing separation from God, and because He was bearing the penalty of the sins of men.

There are increasingly few Christians who can subscribe to either of these statements. The objections to the latter have been frequently stated and are widely felt. It is not, then, necessary to state them here. As to the former statement, all support of it goes if the truth of the latter be denied. For if Christ was not suffering the divine penalty of sin, there would seem to be no adequate ground for supposing that God even temporarily forsook Him. Indeed, if—as we must—we trace the Atonement to the patient love of God, and see in the Cross the manifestation in time of the suffering of God for man till all are redeemed, then it is evident that at no time can God have been so thoroughly united with Jesus as when the final agony of the Cross took place. And this corresponds with Paul's great words, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself' (2 Co 5<sup>19</sup>). This could scarcely be true if at the crucial point of that reconciling work God forsook Christ.

The ordinary explanation of those who deny that God really forsook Christ is that the cry was not a cry of despair and hopelessness, that it was rather an expression of trust in God *in spite of* apparent hopelessness. This is supported by the suggestion that the whole of the 22nd Psalm was on our Lord's mind and was implicitly contained in the first words of it quoted. It may be too much to say that this is an impossible explanation, but it is a little far-fetched.

Nor is the suggestion that the cry was wrung from Jesus as the result of the accumulation of agony and sense of the hatred of men quite satisfactory. Because that would ascribe to Him weakness of a type to which many a Christian martyr has been superior. Nothing is more striking in the history of martyrs than the frequency with which, in the midst of enmity as great and sufferings of a bodily sort perhaps even greater

than those of our Lord, they have been filled with joy, and died with songs of rejoicing. This in its turn is a most remarkable phenomenon and requires explanation. It is from the hypothesis propounded to explain the martyr's joy and unconsciousness of pain, that we may get the key to the problem of our Lord's agony and cry of desertion.

As Dr. Workman says: 'When the great day came, and they passed into the furnace, lo! there was One standing beside them, like unto the Son of Man, and so "they found the fire of their inhuman torturers cold."<sup>1</sup>' That is the statement from the side of religious experience of a nowadays well-known psychological fact, sometimes called 'Obsession.' An idea can so dominate the whole consciousness of a person, that no other thought or sensation is perceived. To the martyr the sense of the presence of Christ was so keen that no other thought could enter his consciousness and the agony of his tortures was unfelt. It was to this fact that his extraordinary fortitude and joy were due. Dr. Workman also suggests that Jesus Christ was alone without such an experience. 'We believe it can be shown that Christ alone really suffered all the horror of His martyrdom—

"Yea, once Immanuel's orphaned cry His universe hath shaken,  
It went up single, echoless, "My God, I am forsaken."

Thus Christ alone *tasted* death, drained the cup of its bitters to the dregs' (*op. cit.* p. 303).

This way of stating it seems to imply the theory that God had really forsaken Christ, the difficulties of which have already been indicated. Nor can it be that God withheld from His Son, when He was supremely doing His will, an experience which He readily granted to an ordinary martyr. There is no satisfactory way but to take a natural explanation for both experiences. Both, that is, must be explained by the state of mind of the subject rather than by some outside intervention. For we must believe that God does not arbitrarily give an experi-

<sup>1</sup> *Persecution in the Early Church*, p. 304.

ence of His presence to one and withhold it from another. The difference must be in the recipient. If, then, we have accounts of two martyrs, one of whom was rapt away from all feeling of his torments and knew only the love of God in Christ, while the other manfully bore them, not unconscious of communion with God and supported by it, but still terribly aware of his own agony, we shall attribute the difference in experience not to diverse measures of divine favour, but to the diverse mental and spiritual factors in the two cases; or to something in the circumstances of the latter that prevented him having the divine obsession.

It appears to be on this line that we may explain the forsaken cry of our Lord. Had His mind been free, it would undoubtedly have been filled with the experience of His Father's presence, just as the mind of the martyr often was. But it was not free. We have no need to ascribe to Jesus the nervous shrinking from pain and the fear of what was coming next, which may in some cases have prevented the martyr having the beatific vision in all its intensity. For this implies a self-regarding impulse which we ought not to attribute to Him who was supremely unselfish. But there is surely one line of thought that we have every reason to suppose was present with Him: the thought of man's sin and separation from the divine harmony, which was manifesting itself in rejecting and slaying God's Ambassador of Peace. This cannot have been absent from our Lord's mind. The writer to the Hebrews speaks with wonderful insight of Jesus enduring the *contradiction of sinners against themselves.*<sup>1</sup> It was that which filled His mind. The realization that He had used all His powers during His ministry to bring men to see the Father and to take the true way of life, and that they, even

<sup>1</sup> He 12<sup>3</sup>, R.V. reading, following Westcott and Hort and the best MSS.

the best, did not rise to it; that the most religious were convinced they knew better; that all forsook Him, and most joined in condemning Him, because they could not, or would not, see God in Him. This realization finally filled the whole field of His consciousness, so that for one moment (it may have been no longer) that consciousness of communion with God, which He had never been without, was interrupted, and He felt Himself desolate. Jesus Christ on the Cross suffered from the obsession of the sin of man, and hence came His momentary cry of despair. But this does not mean that our sin was in any way transferred to Him. Such a thing is impossible. Sin is opposition to God. Jesus never opposed God. The obsession was due to sympathy for man—a sympathy which realized how the will of the Father was the good of men, which they in their sin and folly opposed, thinking it meant them evil. The poignant anguish of a world 'separated from the divine harmony' occupied the whole field of our Lord's consciousness, so that for the moment God was shut out. In His purity and complete union with God He felt by sympathy the tragedy of man's sin as no other man ever felt it.

This explanation is satisfactory as others are not. It does not admit a real separation between Christ and God. The sense of desolation is a phenomenon purely of our Lord's supraliminal consciousness (to use the jargon of the psychologist). But being that it is not the product of moral or reprehensible weakness, as might be the case if it were the product of a self-regarding fear of pain whether physical or mental. It is entirely due to a supremely unselfish concentration in sympathy on the sad plight of men. It is therefore the experience of one who was one with the God of Love—and never more closely one than at that moment.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Paul's Buffeting of his Body.

THERE is a tendency among the commentators on 1 Co 9<sup>26, 27</sup> to deflect it from the official to a more personal application than Paul had in mind. Thus, for example, Hans Windisch (*Taufe und*

*Sünde*, p. 136) wishes us to see in these verses an intimation that Paul required to keep under his bodily passions—or, as Windisch expresses it, 'the temptations to sin which arise from the body'—lest he should be led by them into sin. Accordingly he generalizes from them: 'In the body of

the Christian there moves a sinful power, according to this confession, which the Christian distinguishes from his ego, and which he seeks, with all the energy which his ego can exert, to prevent from coming into action.'

Windisch is much nearer right in an earlier remark to the effect that 'this self-characterization stands in relation to Paul's calling as a teacher'; although he applies this remark wrongly. The Apostle appears, in point of fact, merely to be alluding in these words to the hardships to which he voluntarily subjected himself in preaching to the Corinthians. Others ate and drank and married; he not only denied himself these common rights of man, but laboured without charge, not even taking the gleanings by the way secured by the law to the very labouring oxen, and bringing himself into nothing less than bondage to all. It was thus that he buffeted his body, not that he might overcome its evil impulses, but that by its bondage he might the better prosecute his labours. It was not that he feared his body's passions, but that he was consumed by zeal for the work of the gospel. When he says, 'Lest I myself should be rejected,' he but repeats his 'Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel.' We learn nothing, therefore, from this passage of the Apostle's consciousness of sin, or of 'the psychology of the sinless man.' What we learn is the strenuousness of the Apostle's labour in the gospel, and his subordination of the comforts, and even the necessities, of personal life to its prosecution.

Windisch is quite right in rejecting the remark of Max Meyer (*Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 26), to the effect that the passage shows us the great rôle which 'sin' played in the life of the Apostle, as well as the more generalized one of A. Titius (*Seligkeit*, iii. p. 81), to the effect that it enables us to observe the degree of power which 'sin' still possesses in the believer. But the ground on which he rejects them is not appealing. The Apostle, says he, presents himself as a constant victor; and impulses to sin constantly repressed are not sin. It is quite true, in itself, that 'the natural tendencies to sinful movements remain in Christians.' But it is not of them that this passage speaks. The natural tendencies which the Apostle here represents himself as crushing out were not only in themselves lawful, but their gratification would have been lawful. He was, for his work's sake, denying himself legitimate satisfactions of legitimate bodily needs.

We are far from learning from this passage that 'the Christian is distinguished from the heathen by his conscious thinking and conduct being uninfluenced by his concupiscence,—by being sinless.' What the passage teaches is that Paul, in the matter of the satisfaction of his bodily needs, denied himself, for his work's sake, above other Christians. The contrast is between himself and other Christian workers; not between the Christian and the heathen. And the contrast between the Christian and the heathen which is attributed to the passage, so misunderstood, would not be possible on Paul's lips. The conscious activities of the Christian are not thought of by him as cut loose from his underlying natural movements of impulse. The underlying natural movements of impulse of the Christian are not thought of by him as unaffected by his salvation. With him as with his Lord, the tree is made good that its fruit may be good: his very instincts he expects to be sanctified. So far as his activities were good, they were in his view good, not because they were unaffected by, but because in conflict with them they overcame, inward impulses which, being yielded to, would have made them evil.

B. B. WARFIELD.

*Princeton Theological Seminary.*

### 'The Only-Begotten.'

THIS is one of those half-metaphysical half-physiological terms the use of which in the Church might well be discontinued with advantage from every point of view. The expression is taken from the Latin *unicus*, which is a rendering of the Greek *μονογενής*, which again comes from the Hebrew יְהִיד.

This Hebrew word, however, does not mean 'only begotten.' It is used of Isaac (*Gn 22<sup>2, 12, 16</sup>*), who was not even the first-born, and very far from being an only son (cf. *Gn 25*). But we do not require to go back to the Hebrew. The Greek word *μονογενής* itself has not always the sense which the dictionaries give it. Thus Aquila and Symmachus use it of Isaac in the passages cited above, and so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (11<sup>17</sup>). So also does Josephus (*Ant. i. xiii. 1*), as he does of Izates, prince of Adiabene, although he had a full brother older than himself, and other brothers besides (*Ant. xx. ii. 1*), whom Josephus mentions in the immediately preceding context: 'He (Izates' father) had Monobazu, his

elder brother, by Hélène also, as he had other sons by other wives besides. Yet did he openly place all his affections on this his only begotten son Izates.<sup>1</sup> But even the Latin *unicus* does not necessarily mean an *only* son. Thus in Plautus, *Captives*, Hegio speaks of one of his two sons as *unicus* (I. 147; cf. 150). Similarly, too, even in English, Aegeon in the *Comedy of Errors* calls one of his two sons his *only* son (v. i. 329).

All this seems to show that when in the New Testament, that is, in the Gospel and first Epistle of John (I<sup>14, 18</sup> 3<sup>16, 18</sup> 1<sup>1, 9</sup>), Jesus is spoken of as the 'only begotten' son, this means no more than 'best beloved.' There is no implication that the birth of Jesus differed in kind from that of others. The LXX translation of the Hebrew Bible renders the Hebrew word יְהִי in the passages referred to above by ἀγαπητός, as also in Jg 11<sup>34</sup> (A), Jer 6<sup>26</sup>, Am 8<sup>10</sup>, Zec 12<sup>10</sup>; as the English Version also rightly translates the feminine יְהִי by 'darling' (Ps 22<sup>20</sup> 35<sup>17</sup>).

T. H. WEIR.

*University of Glasgow.*

### St. Chrysostom's Prayer.

ALL who have considered the English version of St. Chrysostom's prayer as given in our Prayer Book, must have been amazed that a Greek Father, who knew the Greek Testament and the Logia far better than any one knows them now, could have said 'who dost promise, that when two or three are gathered together in thy name, thou wilt grant their requests.' No promise was ever made that requests should be granted in the form in which they are asked; in Mt 18<sup>19-20</sup> something will occur (*γενήσεται αὐτοῖς*), a boon will come to them, 'for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'

On looking at St. Chrysostom's prayer in the original Greek one finds an exquisite commentary on this passage: there am I in their midst, praying with them and translating their blind stammering cries into accord with the wider purposes of God and the coming of His kingdom, for I and my Father are one:

ὅ καὶ δυσὶν ἡ τρὶσι συμφωνῶσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματί σου, τὰς αἰτήσεις παρέχειν ἐπαγγειλάμενος· Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τῶν δούλων σου τὰ αἰτήματα πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον πλήρωσον χορηγῶν ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ

<sup>1</sup> So Whiston.

παρόντι αἰῶνι τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ζωὴν αἰώνιον χαρισμένος.

'Who also to two or three, if calling together with one accord upon Thy name, didst promise to offer their requests; do Thou thyself also now fulfil the petitions of Thy servants as may be expedient (for the coming of Thy kingdom), supplying us abundantly in this Age the fuller knowledge of Thy truth, and granting us in the Age to come the boon of Life everlasting.'

The meaning seems to be: 'Thou dost join with us in our requests, putting them into Thine own words, and so dost offer our prayers; Thou art also He who fulfils them.' The translation, 'as may be most expedient for them' is unwarranted by the Greek. No petitions will be fulfilled unless they are in accord with those in the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done.' It may be pointed out that all this is implied in the expression 'in Thy name,' but it is worthy of note that St. Chrysostom says συμφωνῶσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματί σου, which has not the technical significance of εἰς τὸ ὄνομά σου.

This collect in the original Greek is the most perfect exposition on the subject of prayer.

ARCH. STANLEY PERCIVAL.

*Newcastle-on-Tyne.*

### 'Blessed are the pure in (of) heart, for they shall see God' (Matt. v. 8).

IN ancient times, as in modern, the word *heart* was used as signifying the inner life of a man. There was, perhaps, this difference between ancient and modern usage of the word that the former does not distinguish to any extent between the intellectual and moral parts of that inner life as the latter is, at least conventionally, wont to do, hence διάνοια is found, in some passages, in certain Septuagint MSS. instead of καρδία; hence, too, phrases like 'every imagination of the thoughts of his heart' (Gn 6<sup>5</sup>) and 'He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts' (Lk 1<sup>51</sup>). In such expressions it is evident that the writer makes no distinction between what we usually differentiate as heart and mind. Perhaps such comprehensiveness is really the more philosophic way.

It has seemed to me for some time that one good interpretation of our Lord's words is that they are intended to give a hint as to the way in

which God judges a man. ‘The Lord looketh on the heart.’ As these words are used in respect of David and his brothers, they certainly refer, not to a detection, on God’s part, of the motive a man may have for a particular act, but to the general state and trend of his inner life—‘heart’ being every phase of this inner life.

So Christ seems to be saying, ‘*You* think, Blessed are the surface-pure. You judge both righteous and sinners by surface qualities, the righteous by surface good qualities (I am not denying that they are good) and the sinners by surface bad qualities (I am not denying that they are bad). But God judges by the heart.’ And if the *heart* is pure (I should say that *καθαποί* means almost childlike, or *fresh*) the outward impurities which a man can hardly help gathering in a workaday world matter the less. But, if the *heart* is otherwise, no amount of cleansing the outside of the cup and platter will make much difference.

It happens, accordingly, that certain publicans and harlots enter the kingdom before some other people, because, in spite of surface-impurities, their heart is fresh. And it happens that David is commended as a man after God’s own heart, although he did some things which were very wrong; because, somehow, he managed to keep his heart sound, the wrong-doing, as it were, never ate into his manhood’s fabric. But surface-impurities are not dismissed as of *no* account. The bathed are bidden to wash their feet, and to perform that office for each other, that they may be clean every whit. The heart-pure, that is to say, are to get surface-impurities removed.

The heart-pure’s blessing is an instinct for finding God in persons, in things, in events. Where others will see but a loathsome human wreck, they will see God (they may not call it God; if not religiously inclined they will probably call it brother: it is all the same). Surface-purity cannot bestow, nor surface-impurity of itself withhold this instinct.

It is the natural concomitant of the inner condition of these people.

ARTHUR JONES.

*Handsworth, Birmingham.*

### Psalm xvi. 1.

‘God is our refuge and strength,—  
A very present help in trouble.’

THE forty-sixth Psalm has such a hold on the religious life of all Churches, and has become so

potent a factor in their experiences, that many may deem it almost profane to suggest any departure from long-established readings. Facts must nevertheless be faced, and results will be found to justify change of view.

The primary impulse to examine this first verse carefully may be felt by one who reads only the common English translation, ‘God is our refuge and strength,—a very present help in trouble.’ The first half may be at once accepted without suspicion; but does it not seem strange that, in the second line, the Lord is described as a ‘very present’ help in times of distress? One can understand that He may fitly be viewed as ‘present,’ but presence or absence cannot properly be imagined as admitting of degrees: a person is either wholly present or wholly absent, not partly present or partly absent, and exception may thus reasonably be taken to the expression ‘very present,’ just as one may object to ‘very full,’ or ‘very complete.’

This initial difficulty, however, naturally constrains us to scrutinize carefully the received Hebrew text; and the latter, when viewed with a critical eye, compels us to read it in a way different from that to which we have long been accustomed.<sup>1</sup> The truth is that translators generally have misread the Hebrew form נִצְחָה, by supposing it to be the Niphal (passive) participle of נִצַּח ('find'), and thus to be rendered primarily ‘found,’ but more conveniently to be translated as ‘existing,’ or ‘present.’<sup>2</sup> They do not seem, however, to have perceived the grammatical difficulty into which they brought themselves and others; for the noun עֹרֶה ('help') is plainly a feminine noun; while נִצְחָה, which they mistakenly attached to it as its attributive, is undeniably masculine: this abnormality, unfortunately, has since been either intentionally ignored, or has not been even perceived. How, then, is נִצְחָה to be treated? Just as what it actually is,—not the Niphal participle, but as the first pers. plur. of the Qal,<sup>3</sup> which then takes the noun עֹרֶה as its appropriate accusative, and enables

<sup>1</sup> The Septuagint reading of the second line (*βοηθός εὐθληψειν ταῖς εὑρόσαις ἡμᾶς σφόδρα*) gives no practical solution of our difficulties.

<sup>2</sup> See Gn 19<sup>16</sup>, ‘thy two daughters who are present’; 1 Ch 29<sup>17</sup>, ‘thy people who are present here’; Gn 47<sup>14</sup>, ‘all he money which was found in Egypt’; see also Jer 41<sup>3</sup> 52<sup>25</sup>, etc.

<sup>3</sup> The forms of these two parts of the verb are identical.

us legitimately to render the first part of the second line thus, 'help in distresses we find.'

But now, what is to be done with מְאֹד ('very'), the closing form in the verse? Certainly, it cannot be utilized as the Massoretes have unwisely fixed it for us, but a slight change in either of two directions will give good sense. It may either be read most simply as the resemblant מִנְאָד ('from calamity,' or, 'against complete destruction'; see Job 18<sup>12</sup> 21<sup>17.30</sup>, Ps 18<sup>19</sup>, etc.); but as something of this meaning is already given in the preceding noun בְּצֻרוֹת ('in distresses'), a preferable substitute is בְּנֵל, which has most to commend itself.

Let us now summarize the benefits arising from adoption of the foregoing suggestions.

First, we rid ourselves of the questionable expression 'very present.'

Second, the grammatical irregularity in Hebrew Syntax produced by the combination 'a present help,' is quite removed.

Third, for the whole verse, there results a simple and beautiful parallelism, and this of a somewhat rare construction, in which the leading features of the first line are given *inversely* in the second: a divine name begins the first, but another ends the second; in the middle of each line there appears the plural of the first personal pronoun ('us,' 'we'); while mention of divine aid comes at the end of the first line, but at the beginning of the second. Thus—

God [is] to us a refuge and strength;  
Help in distresses we find from the Almighty.<sup>1</sup>

JAMES KENNEDY.

*New College, Edinburgh.*

<sup>1</sup> On the change from מַלְכֵינוּ to לְנוּ, see Ps 7<sup>12</sup>, etc.

## Entre Nous.

### SOME TEXTS.

#### Romans vi. 7.

Mr. Alex. Pallis, who is a Greek by birth and a scholar by training, has written a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The title is simply *To the Romans* (Liverpool Booksellers' Co., 70 Lord Street).

It is generally held now that the Epistle to the Romans was written in Corinth. Mr. Pallis does not believe that. There is no trace in it of the troubles then existing in Corinth. Nor does he believe that it was written to Rome. It is written to a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles who have become Christians, possessing *agapæ* and therefore an organized Church. But when Paul reached Rome afterwards there were no Christians there, certainly no Gentile Christians, the 'brethren' who met him being brethren according to the flesh. Nor was it written by the Apostle Paul. 'How could St. Paul have told such a puerile untruth as that he went so far as Illyricum? This journey and that to Spain are alike myths on a par with Andrew's tour throughout Thrace, Philip's journey to Parthia, and Matthew's visit to the land of the Sunless and Hole-dwellers.' And then 'the

language of the Romans throughout lacks that spontaneity, unconventionality, and ruggedness which we so very much admire in the Corinthians and the Galatians.' Mr. Pallis believes that the epistle was written in Alexandria by some Jew. 'In its original form the epistle was fairly simple, and its simplicity probably commended it to the Alexandrian faithful and made it popular; with the result that, as it has happened more or less to other popular writings of antiquity, it was tampered with. One of the interpolators, a theologian—or perhaps more than one—tacked on long and irrelevant disquisitions between chapters 6 and 11; and the work was further amplified by all manner of accretions, so that finally it became one of the hardest to follow in Greek literature.'

Mr. Pallis's Commentary is as original as his Introduction. Take the note on Ro 6<sup>7</sup>. The R.V. translation is, 'For he that hath died is justified from sin.' Mr. Pallis says: 'This is a most extraordinary statement; it is in flat contradiction with the view of future retribution, so firmly held by all Christians, and, as a matter of course, shared by our author. I believe that "he that hath died is justified" reproduces a proclamation customary

at funeral rites, which notified that the departed whose remains were being laid in the grave had obtained his grace from God, his wrongs to those present having been forgiven. This comforting idea is still alive among the Greeks, who generally refer to a dead man as ὁ συνχωρεμένος. As a development, a dead man so forgiven, δεδικαιωμένος, became in the popular imagination a δίκαιος, a sinless man, a saint. Cf. Jn 17-19, for their good I saint myself (=I die). It is in this latter sense I think that the interpolator quoted the ritual words as a proof that we, having once died and become δίκαιοι, no longer shall be liable to sin.'

*i John iv. 3.*

The A.V. reads, 'Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.' The R.V. omits the words 'Christ is come in the flesh.' In the margin the Revisers offer 'annulleth' for 'confesseth not,' after another Greek reading. Dr. Gore in his new book on *The Epistles of St. John* (Murray; 6s. net) accepts that reading, but thinks that 'annulleth' should be 'dissolveth.' The text is of the utmost importance as St. John's test of discipleship. Every spirit, says the Apostle, that dissolveth Jesus is not a Christian. Dr. Gore takes it to refer to a doctrine which 'dissolves' Christ's person, 'and instead of acknowledging one person, the Son of God made flesh, postulates two persons or beings—a higher divine being called the Son or the Christ, and an ordinary human being called Jesus. Such teaching would accordingly involve the denial that the man Jesus was or is, in His own person, either the Son or the divine Christ, or, to put it otherwise, would deny the verity of the Incarnation—that truly and really the eternal Son was "made flesh."

### SOME TOPICS.

#### Interpretation.

Messrs. Dent have published a volume of lectures by Stopford A. Brooke on *Naturalism in English Poetry* (7s. 6d. net). They are well worth publishing. Never was Stopford Brooke happier in his chosen and well-worked field of study; never did he lecture with more enjoyment to his hearers. And now that his hearers have become his readers their enjoyment is not in any degree diminished. The lecture in which Wordsworth and Shelley and Byron are compared is one of the finest and truest

tributes to Wordsworth's genius that we have ever read.

But what did Stopford Brooke's audience think when they heard the lecture on 'Shelley and Christianity'? Its vindication of Shelley from the charge of atheism is well enough, though it is not quite convincing. But the astonishing thing is that the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, LL.D., identifies himself with Shelley in almost everything that he says about Christianity. Even this extraordinary attempt at interpretation is accepted: 'From that saying of "Be ye perfect, as your Father is perfect," Shelley infers that Jesus taught that the perfection of the divine and human character was the same. "The abstract perfection of the human character is the type of the actual perfection of the divine." And no truer thing can possibly be said of the teaching of Christ. "I and the Father are one." I, a man, am at one with the Father. This is what I am ceaselessly trying to teach as the very root of the doctrine of Jesus. He said it, not as God, but as a man—not for himself alone, but for all mankind. "We and the Father are one." And the poet saw that truth in Jesus, as we see it now. Indeed, it is the very foundation of all the doctrine of Christ; the ground of personal and social religion; the ground of all human associations and their duties; the ground of the rights of man and of their liberty, equality, and fraternity; the ground of their happiness and their immortality. It is the one saying we should inscribe on the banner of human progress: "We and the Father are one." It is a wonderful thing that Shelley saw this so many years ago, and saw it in the teaching of Jesus Christ.'

#### Scottish Life.

It may be that Dean Ramsay left some gleanings behind him; it may be that some of his stories can be told over again by this time; and it may be that the Scottish folk who have lived since Dean Ramsay's day are as truly Scottish as ever: in any case the Rev. T. McWilliam, M.A., Minister of Foveran in Aberdeenshire, has collected some fine examples of Scottish wit and wisdom into his book on *Scottish Life in Light and Shadow* (Gardner). The most characteristic chapter is the sketch of 'Weelum.'

"Hulloa, William, that's a new horse you have got! What's become of the old white one?"

"Well, minister," was the reply, "ye see, there wis some kin' o' knots aboot the beast—a thing I never kint o' in a horse afore, but ane's aye learnin'. I thocht I was gyaun tae loss 'im athegither, so I just selt him till anither man."

"And what did the other man think o' the knots?" said the minister, with a demure face.

"What a twinkle there was in the old man's eyes as he replied, "Deed, noo, it niver occurred to me to mention the thing till him. I-jist gied him the beast as I got him mysel."

#### Mysticism.

Dr. Gore's definition is worth recording. It is quite clear and orderly. He is discussing in his book on *The Epistle of St. John* the question whether the Apostle John (whom he takes to be author of Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse) was a mystic. 'By the term "mystics" we describe a class of thinkers who have three special characteristics—first, that they are not content with a surface view of the world or with its external aspect, but (in Wordsworth's phrase) "see into the life of things"; secondly, that they have an intensely vivid perception of the unity of all things in God—they see God in all things and all things in God, and find in communion with God, aimed at and in part realized here and now, the chief occupation of their lives; thirdly, that their method of arriving at truth is not the method of argument or discursive reasoning, but the method of intuition; they do not arrive at truth by critical inquiry or antagonism to error, but by a sort of positive vision or feeling.' Was St. John a mystic, then? 'Now St. John has all those characteristics to an intense degree. He is thus intensely mystical.'

#### NEW POETRY.

##### Gladys Cromwell.

Gladys and Dorothea Cromwell 'were born in November, 1885, and inherited possessions, talents, and an exquisite beauty strangely poignant because in the twin sisters the charm seemed more than doubled. There are a few men and women with whom one feels a sense of spiritual mystery: one walks with them always on the road to Emmaus. It was true of these two. They found their home in the unseen. In the outer, material world they existed only by an effort that cost them much, for they

moved as spirits, untouched by crude desires; bending with a shy longing to meet human needs; searching for some solution that should justify their personal immunities, their money, and the grace and luxury to which they had been born.'

'In January, 1918, the two sisters, having enrolled in the Canteen Service of the Red Cross, sailed for France and were stationed at Chalons. For eight months they worked under fire on long day or night shifts; their free time was filled with volunteer outside service; they slept in "caves" or under trees in a field; they suffered from the exhaustion that is so acute to those who have never known physical labour; yet no one suspected until the end came that for many months they had believed their work a failure, and their efforts futile. The Chalonais called them "The Saints"; during dull evenings, the poilus, who adored the "Twin Angels," found amusement in effort, always unsuccessful, to distinguish them apart. The workers in the Canteen loved and admired them for their courage—that finest bravery which leads fear to intrepid action; they loved them for their rare charm, but they gave them whole-souled appreciation for the tireless, efficient labor which made them invaluable as practical canteeners.'

'After the Armistice, when they returned to Chalons as guests, they showed symptoms of nervous prostration, but years of self-control and consideration for others made them conceal the black horror in which they lived—the agony through which they saw a world which they felt contained no refuge for beauty and quiet thought. In such a world they conceived they had no place, and when on their way home they jumped from the deck of the *Lorraine*, it was in response to a vision that promised them fulfilment and peace. They died on the 19th of January, 1919. Three months later they were buried in France with military honours, and the French Government has awarded them the Croix de Guerre and the Médaille de Reconnaissance française. They gave to the world lives of shining promise and crystal purity, having followed Him who said to His other disciples: Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend.'

These pines could feel the wind, the snow,  
The April sun;  
But through them now no changes flow.

These pines could feel the grief and mirth  
Of quiet years;  
But now they know unchanging dearth.

And they can feel no mood of spring:  
Like certain souls  
Who find in flame their blossoming.

That is the story. There is nothing to add to it. Gladys was the poet. Her book is *Poems* (Macmillan; \$1.50). Take this poem on

#### THE CROWNING GIFT.

I have had courage to accuse;  
And a fine wit that could upbraid;  
And a nice cunning that could bruise;  
And a shrewd wisdom, unafraid  
Of what weak mortals fear to lose.

I have had virtue to despise  
The sophistry of pious fools;  
I have had firmness to chastise;  
And intellect to make me rules  
To estimate and exorcise.

I have had knowledge to be true;  
My faith could obstacles remove;  
But now my frailty I endue.  
I would have courage now to love,  
And lay aside the strength I knew.

#### Gilbert Thomas.

The name of Mr. Gilbert Thomas is familiar to the readers of poetry, for he has contributed poems to many periodicals, and he has published five or six volumes of poetry. Now Mr. Thomas has surveyed the whole poetical production of his life, and into one volume called *Poems: 1912-1919* (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net) he has gathered all the poems that he wishes to retain. Let one poem serve to stir the memory, or, if that is unnecessary, to determine the inspiration:

#### 'NOT PEACE, BUT A SWORD!'

'Not peace! A sword I come to bring!'—  
And with its keen edge didst Thou thrust  
The empty pomp of priest and king  
Into the empty dust.

Yet was Thy sword our peace! For spurned  
Wert Thou, and for Thy blood they cried;  
And so on Calvary they returned  
The sword—into Thy side!

Nor dreamt they that it should release  
(While vengeance thus they were demanding)  
That sacramental flow of peace  
Which passeth understanding!

#### Rhys Carpenter.

Mr. Carpenter is not careful to be reckoned a great poet. He sings because he must. He sings most happily when he has children for his theme. His 'Fairy Gold' is a vindication of the reality of the world of fairies. And once at least he becomes truly poetical in his tribute to the justice of British rule. Remember as you read the poem that Mr. Carpenter is a citizen of the United States of America:

#### A MARCHING SONG FOR ENGLAND IN THE EAST.

From Egypt into China they have builded them  
a wall;  
They have held the front of Eden on the  
Teuton and his thrall;  
On the snowy stairs of Elburz you may hear  
their bugles call,  
'Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe.'

There are gardens in the southland where the  
Tartar may not go;  
There is dewy corn in Babel where the desert  
used to blow;  
In the vineyards over Gaza you may see the  
grapes aglow:  
Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe.

You shall watch the ships adrift with the  
Tigris under keel;  
In the crooked streets of Baghdad you shall see  
the camels kneel  
With the good things out of Persia that the  
robber could not steal:  
Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe!

In the brain of wounded England lay the  
silence for a span;  
Then she rose and wrought a marvel by the  
steppe of Turkestan;

Oh, ye women-folk of Irak; oh, ye children of Iran,  
Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe!

The title of the book is *The Plainsman* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net).

#### Helen Dircks.

This is the preface to *Passenger*, by Helen Dircks (Chatto & Windus; 3s. 6d. net):

Passenger  
Am I  
In that machine of days  
Which runs  
Between the city and the stars;  
No citizen  
Of one delight  
Or any stopping-place:  
I journey  
On and on,  
Until  
I shall become  
A freight of dust  
at last. . . .

And that is the manner of many of the poems. It is said to be an easy manner—but perhaps that was before it was tried. Once and again there is an ethical note struck, and it is worthy:

#### WITHHOLDING.

Ah, you will be no thief nor take  
The false coin for the true,  
Nor let a single soiled caress  
Be passed between us two.

And yet you know how sweet 'twould be  
To take what you might take;  
But you do hold yourself in love  
And honour for my sake.

As you have willed, so let it be,  
My dear—and yet, more dear  
Is all your true withholding than  
If you had held me near.

#### S. Raleigh Simpson.

The author of *Nondescript Numbers* (Gardner), Mr. S. Raleigh Simpson, takes the writing of poetry light-heartedly. The gift of rhyming is most mani-

fest. But the author has an ear for rhythm also. Here is one of the more serious songs:

#### CINNA'S SONG.

Some rejoice, while others weep;  
Fixt the doom divine doth keep:  
What man soweth he shall reap.

Silent as soft dews that fall,  
Slowly, searchingly for all  
Mills of God grind very small.

None can read the book of fate;  
Death gives answer, swift or late:  
Seek for light beyond heaven's gate.

#### Wilfred Rowland Childe.

A most unpretending book of poetry by Wilfred Rowland Childe is published by Mr. W. Brierley, Bond Street, Leeds, under the title of *The Hills of Morning*. But it is poetry. Feed your imagination on it. No price is named, but it will probably cost about a shilling. Feast your feeling for style upon it. Quotation is not easy where the variety is so manifold. But this sonnet may be given:

#### PRAYER TO THE AUGUST ORIGIN.

Let Thy love lighten on the land like rain,  
O Father: bind the broken limbs and bless  
With balsam our sick hearts: our nakedness  
Raiment in glory. Like a flower from pain  
Bid our devotion and our rapture rise.  
Lo, in this Island cradled on the surge  
Thou hast Thy gardens: bid all toilers urge  
The herbs to grow, that when the summer  
skies  
Of opulent June their sapphire patterns trace  
Over the minsters and the shining streams  
Of Albion, Thy belovèd, there may be  
Plenteous reward for all Thy tender grace:  
Let roses lovely as a poet's dreams  
Cover the laughing land from sea to sea!

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.